









THE NEW WORLD

COPYRIGHT, 1920, BY
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEDICATED
TO
THE TOILER'S TRUEST FRIEND
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

MAY HIS COUNSEL BE WITH US TO-DAY
AND DURING ALL THE DAYS TO COME

Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the Charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political slogan of the nation.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	PROBLEMS FACING A STRICKEN WORLD	I
II.	THE PROBLEM OF EUROPE'S POVERTY	13
III.	THE WILL TO WORK	27
IV.	UNREST BEFORE THE WAR WAS AN ACORN, TO-DAY IT IS AN OAK	38
V.	A TRAGEDY OF POLITICS	54
VI.	THE WORD BOLSHEVISM HAS SEIZED UPON THE IMAGINATION OF THE WORLD	67
VII.	THE TEST	79
VIII.	RUSSIA'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—FROM RURIK TO NICHOLAS	90
IX.	RUSSIA OUT OF BALANCE	101
X.	THE BEGINNING OF THE DICTATORSHIP—THE BIRTH OF BOLSHEVISM	118
XI.	THE SOVIET MACHINE	132
XII.	THE SOVIET DEFINITION OF LIBERTY	148
XIII.	CLASH OF FACT AND THEORY	160
XIV.	THE FAILURE OF THE SOCIALIZATION OF INDUSTRY . .	170
XV.	THE ABUSE OF POWER	183
XVI.	THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL	192
XVII.	INTERMEDDLING IN RUSSIA	215
XVIII.	BOLSHEVISM IN THE UNITED STATES	224
XIX.	THE NEW WORLD	250
 APPENDICES:		
	I. DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE LA- BORING AND EXPLOITED PEOPLE	269
	II. A DECLARATION BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED	275
	III. CONSTITUTION	281
	IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	306
	V. PLATFORM OF COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL . .	333
	VI. MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST INTER- NATIONAL	347

THE NEW WORLD

CHAPTER I

PROBLEMS FACING A STRICKEN WORLD

FOUR years of pagan hell left Europe stunned and staggering. The world had gone through the reddest and blackest night in all the biography of the planet. With the signing of the Armistice the people tried to shake off the nightmare and grope back to light. To-day, twenty months after, they are still trudging and stumbling, paralyzed and benumbed. The problem to-day of making the world safe for civilization is more serious than was the question of making it safe for democracy nearly six years ago. If there was cause for sacrifice then, there is greater reason for it now. If there was occasion for a military morale then, there is need of an industrial morale to-day. Freedom called men to fight that autocracy might not rule the world. The present issue is not only freedom, it is life—the chance to eat, to be warm, to sleep. A tired, wounded, worn and weary people face the to-morrows with little faith and much fear.

I went to Europe to see for myself. I was unattached,

a free agent. I was not a member of any mission—I had no preconceived opinions. I sought facts—the human facts. I looked into the eyes of the people, walked the streets, talked with men, women and children, rich and poor, humble and powerful, journalists, bankers, lawyers, preachers, actors, government officials, miners, teamsters, factory hands, labor leaders, radicals, conservatives, children of the streets and women at their washtubs, farmers and peasants, tenants and landlords. I searched official records and pursued official figures. I listened to opinions, heard speeches, listened to the conversations of the cafés and the talk in the cheap restaurants.

I knew that few Americans would have a chance to go to Europe to see and hear for themselves, that the millions in America would be compelled to depend upon the eyes and ears of others for information concerning the problem of world importance, a problem which is bound to involve us—we are part of it. No country is entirely independent; nations are interdependent to the same extent and for the same reasons as individuals. Europe looks to America for salvation as a dying man looks to God for mercy. If the United States adopts the policy of leaving Europe alone on the theory that we have done enough for her, Europe will be plunged into the savagery of revolution. Faith in America, belief that America will sustain her and help her carry the awful load is keeping Europe from succumbing. This is about the only thing she has left.

What is America? It is not the buildings and banks, the railroads, the shops, the factories and the land; it is

the one hundred and ten million people of whom you are one. So, Europe's plea is addressed to you. The prayers of her hungry children are petitions to you. America's answer will come from the people. No man or woman in the United States can escape the responsibility. It is not a hypothetical case; it is a question involving the life of human beings, men, women and children, who are blood of our blood, part of the great world family—the human race. Shall we close down our shops, factories, mills and mines, bolt the doors and stop production at a time when millions of human beings are crying to us for help? Will we listen to the thin bony hands of children knocking at our doors and, safe in our comfortable homes, leave them to die? No call to arms ever had so much back of it, so much humanity in it as the call to work has to-day.

The house of Europe has been on fire. It has been wrecked. It is scarred and charred—almost a ruin. The cupboards are empty, the people demoralized and sick. Hunger has a strangle hold. The people are in rags. They must rebuild and they have not the material for rebuilding. They turn to us; their condition is their plea, our abundance our obligation.

In our house things are well. We have been saved the devastation of war. Our acres are ample; our yield has been plentiful; we have an abundance of raw material. Our man power has been comparatively slightly touched by the war. True, we gave nearly seventy thousand lives that the Prussians might not pass; that autocracy might not shackle the world. It was our best blood. Europe

gave for four years and she gave of her youth until her man power was practically exhausted.

We cannot sacrifice Europe without being injured. If Europe falls America will totter. The storm of unrest that rocks Europe will shake America. We must work and help.

The heart of labor is warm. Its sympathy is born of suffering. The gospel of the brotherhood of man is the message labor has always taught.

If I could picture the poverty of Europe, the wretchedness of her hungry children and women and men, if I could only make people see what I have seen in Europe, our difficulties would indeed seem trivial by comparison with their sufferings. Men would will to work and find joy in the working. What greater compensation is there than working to feed the hungry, to clothe the ragged, to comfort the lowly?

If the heart of capital is stone and will not feel the message which comes over the seas, labor can show that its heart is human and that it will suffer injustice, if need be, a little longer to save flesh and blood, brother and sister toilers on the other side of the ocean. It is a crime against God and man to stop production in this hour. Extravagance is a crime; waste is immoral.

I did not stop with the gathering of records and figures, for while figures are important, they do not often disclose the fullness of truth. Official reports and statistics, granting they are accurate, are at best only photographic. The photograph records with mathematical exactness the exterior of things. It seldom gets to the heart of the

object. The photograph is the still picture—the outline of the motionless fact. Impressions are more like an oil painting. They show the human touch. They reach the heart of issues. Back of the daubs of paint on the canvas are the throbs of a heart. The film is only sensitized. Man's brain is sensitive. The photograph reproduces the image. The painting catches the substance.

In reporting the things I saw and heard, I want to give both photographs and paintings—facts and figures as I learned them and the impressions I gathered from the speech and life of Europe.

In the June of 1914 Europe had a place in the sunlight of peace. The fields were filled with peasants bending their backs to toil. Villagers were happy in the common routine of their simple lives. Factories, mills, mines and shops were filled with workers. Wheels hummed. Smoke streamed from chimneys. Industry was singing. In the cities traffic roared, trains rattled. It was the story of a busy working world.

Problems there were, of course, the problems normal to the growth and progress of the world. There was some unrest, too, but children scampered to school; patient women sang crooning songs to their babies. Men carrying dinner buckets whistled on their way to work. There were, as there always have been, shadows, the unlighted side of the world street—the slums and the tenements, but men and women were planning and fighting the black ugliness, and every one had faith in the tomorrow. We were making headway; the world was

growing better. Its conscience was awakened. It was a normal, sane old world. It was good to be alive.

Then came the day, the day that will never be forgotten, the day that changed the world; the day of four years at the end of which civilization was almost hunch-backed.

EUROPE RISING FROM THE WAR

August 1, 1914, was the day. On that day Germany declared war on Russia. The fire alarm rang round the world. Peasants in the fields straightened their backs, listened and looked into the sun, confused, wondering. Flags were unfurled. Bands called to arms; faces were white, tense and serious. Men left their work and talked in groups on the street corners; women laid aside their tasks and whispered their fears; fright lighted their eyes. Children stopped playing. Something had happened. Evil things were ahead.

August 3 and 4 found France and Great Britain mobilizing their manhood. The torch was sweeping Europe—the fire of death had started.

For four long years, heart-sickening years, the world ran red. Men waded through mud and blood, fought, suffered, cursed and prayed, while back home in the manless houses women and children worked, cried, prayed and waited. The world was mad. Death poisoned every breath the people breathed.

It is over now, it is finished. A weak, heartbroken Europe is again sitting in the light of peace, but threatening clouds are in the sky. Europe is in black rags; the

black her mourning, the rags her poverty. Her face is furrowed, trenches made by suffering. Her eyes are downcast and dead. Hope flutters weakly in her breast; faith has almost faded from her soul; her home is a house of darkness. The fire on the hearth has turned to cold gray ashes. The kettle no longer sings; it sobs. Her mind is weary, her body wasted. Hunger has robbed her of strength. Her feet are blue from cold. Her lips wear privation's pallor. Ice in the winter's wind lashes her shivering half-naked body. She mumbles as she stares vacantly into space—she is tired, so tired. It seemed to me that a face so troubled and sad must have never known a smile.

I listened to her mumblings; she was counting. Over and over again she counted on her thin, tired, worn hands—she was counting her dead.

Her eyes looked over the hundreds of thousands of square miles of the war zone scarred with trenches, pitted and pock-marked by shells. She sees where they fell, but no tears are in her eyes. Long ago the hurt reached the point where tears dry up. Row upon row, line upon line, mile upon mile of white painted wooden crosses mark their graves. For the greater part they were her youngest born, her best beloved who dug deep in the soil to sleep forever in dark dugouts.

As they fell bleeding from steel and lead, choking with gas, writhing in the agony of liquid fire, they proved in the dying "word" they spoke that they were mere boys, as they had shown in their fighting that they were brave strong men. To the poppies they entrusted

their message, and the red poppies remember the dying "word" of Europe's martyred sons, they who went out into the silence with this last word on their lips, "Mother."

Europe has finished counting. An ache shudders through her bent body. She sighs and sobs: "7,781,806 of my sons were killed in battle."

Her thoughts turn to the living, her arms open to receive them. She holds them to her heart. They have returned, but how? The woe of it! Some with sightless eyes, doomed to grope through the world in a never-ending darkness, a night without stars or moon; sullen, black hopeless days, young men in the very morning of their day.

Others sentenced to silence, deaf and dumb. Never again will she hear their voices nor will they hear hers.

Still others in wheel chairs, dwarfed, legless.

More hobbling on crutches, others limping on canes. Many with empty sleeves. Some with great scars where once was a handsome face.

Despoiled Europe, she sees them all, the twisted, the mangled, the torn. She has counted them, the 20,477,-541, the wounded of the war.

Doggedly she counts on. Seven million of her sons were marked, "Missing and Prisoners" in the official war books. Many of these have come back to her. She does not question them. She dare not. Their faces tell of the unspeakable horrors endured. She sees in their eyes a depth of pain that is unfathomable. She is a mother—she understands.

The war is over, but Europe is not over the war. Must she never stop counting? Is there no end to her losses? The graveyards are crowded, her thoughts turn to her civilian dead who, while they did not die in the war, died because of the war. Those who went out in battle left life in a burst of glory. Others there were who fell in their tracks; exhaustion, broken hearts, war privations were the causes. She has not forgotten how the home flank suffered. The stay-at-homes were not all slackers. Most of them were not stay-at-homes through choice. They fought hunger and cold, bent their backs beyond the straining point; worst of all, they waited.

It is estimated that nearly 15,000,000 civilians died from weakness, fatigue, strain, overwork, destroyed resistance. These for the most part were the underfed older men and women, the scared undernourished children. No need for wonder that Europe has the death look in her eyes. For four years with their months, weeks, days, hours, minutes and seconds death has been her Nemesis.

She is now totaling her losses. The figures are appalling. They stagger imagination. The world is bewildered by the number. It is stupendous, too horrible for understanding.

Over 6,000,000 of the wounded are human wrecks. For the United States the number wounded, 192,483, is equal approximately to the total adult male population of the city of Baltimore.

It is said that the dead of the war marching in column

STORY OF THE TERRIBLE WAR COST

Country	NUMBER			
	Total mobilized forces	Killed	Wounded	Prisoners or missing
	1	2	3	4
ALLIES				
Russia.....	12,000,000	1,700,000	4,950,000	2,500,000
France.....	7,500,000	1,385,300	2,675,000	446,300
British Empire.....	7,500,000	692,065	2,037,325	360,367
Italy.....	5,500,000	460,000	947,000	1,393,000
Serbia.....	707,343	322,000	28,000	100,000
Roumania.....	750,000	200,000	120,000	80,000
United States.....	4,272,521	67,813	192,483	14,363
Belgium.....	267,000	20,000	60,000	10,000
Greece.....	230,000	15,000	40,000	45,000
Portugal.....	100,000	4,000	15,000	200
Montenegro.....	50,000	3,000	10,000	7,000
Japan.....	800,000	300	907	3
Total.....	39,676,864	4,869,478	11,075,715	4,956,233
CENTRAL POWERS				
Germany.....	11,000,000	1,611,104	3,683,143	772,522
Austria-Hungary	6,500,000	800,000	3,200,000	1,211,000
Turkey.....	1,600,000	300,000	570,000	130,000
Bulgaria.....	400,000	201,224	152,399	10,825
Total.....	19,500,000	2,912,328	7,605,542	2,124,347
Grand total.....	59,176,864	7,781,806	18,681,257	7,080,580

'four abreast would require ten days and nights to pass a given point.

Who can measure this loss?

War brought death. It did more, it stopped births. In the devastated regions of Belgium, France, Italy, Poland, parts of Russia and the Balkan countries, the birth rate fell. In England and Wales the birth rate in the last part of 1915 was the lowest on record. Mallet calculated that the birth rate had fallen twelve per cent in England and Wales by 1916. In 1914 the birth rate

in England and Wales was 879,096. In 1918 it had dropped to 662,773. To put it another way, but for the war the births in the United Kingdom from May, 1915, to June, 1918, should have been 3,500,000, instead there were only 2,950,000 births.

In Italy the number of births in 1914 was 1,114,000. In 1916 only 882,000. In France 594,000 births were recorded in 1914 and only 252,000 in 1915. During the three years of the war it was officially estimated that births in Germany had decreased forty per cent.

The *Journal of Heredity* quotes Savorganan as having estimated that it will take England at least ten years, Germany twelve years, Italy thirty-eight years and France sixty-eight years to recover their populations. In France, I was advised that over fifty per cent of the men between twenty and forty years were listed as dead or totally incapacitated.

The human waste of the war is more than sad memories. The loss of man power is a problem. It has thrown out of balance the economic and domestic scheme of the world. Readjustment will take the greater part of the century, for there are more women than men. In the May, 1916, issue of the *North American Review*, William A. Rossiter estimated an excess of approximately 17,600,000 females. This calculation was based upon the assumption at that date of an early termination of hostilities. Home life is bound to suffer. There will be fewer marriages, fewer children. Statistics tell only part of the story.

Europe is not dying; she is exhausted, troubled, con-

fused; she is trying to find herself. She is putting all of her remaining strength into the effort. The task before her is stupendous. She must rebuild her house, nurse her wounded, care for her cripples. She has counted her losses, inventoried her possessions.

The past must bury its dead. To-morrow is for the living. To-day Europe is planning for to-morrow. To understand her work, to know her plans, to feel her problem, it is necessary to know her thoughts.

Unrest is threatening her. Fear is keeping her from work. It is causing her worry. Fear that peace will not be permanent—even greater, the fear that irritation and unrest may break out in violence. With all her soul she is pleading to the rich and powerful to become as little children again, her children. She is telling them that the fate of the family is at stake, that they must make concessions to their brothers. She is trying to make them understand they are brothers. Many of them have forgotten the relationship. When she urges them to stop wrangling and quarreling, she is pleading for their common good, the family welfare. She is warning against justice too long denied, of unrest too long pent up. She is translating the mutterings of the discontented. She knows the complaint in their hearts. She sympathizes.

This was Europe as I saw her in black rags arising from the war.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM OF EUROPE'S POVERTY

THE Armistice ended the fighting. The signing of the peace treaty brought peace, but neither of these acts restored devastated Europe. The big job ahead is the work of reconstruction, and when I write the word "reconstruction" I have not in mind the mere rebuilding of the war devastated areas of France, Belgium, Italy and Poland. Gigantic and important as this task is, necessary as it is, it is only a small part of the work of reconstruction. Thousands of square miles make up the war zone, the ground marched over, the territory under shell fire. Millions of acres of land that once yielded food in response to the touch of the plow have for four years been tilled by explosives.

Cities and villages are jungles of twisted, broken, torn iron, wood, brick and stone. I have walked through many of these villages and have stood stunned by the completeness of the destruction. The streets are uneven, lumpy masses of brick, stone, plaster, glass, aisles of wreckage, roofless houses with walls gutted and torn, disordered piles of brick and building material are jagged pinnacles, masses of débris. Had I not known of the war and come upon one of these unsightly shapeless

ruins I should have concluded that nature had entered into a mad conspiracy, combining and concentrating all of the powers of a cyclone, a tornado and an earthquake, and spilled its fury on these mangled dead villages.

Picture the refugees returning to these villages—coming back home, what the sight must have meant to them. I have seen some of them, their faces gray as the ruins, standing in the midst of their destroyed homes. I have watched them picking their way over piles of stone and brick through great openings in the broken walls, and I saw in their eyes homesickness, a hurt of heart beyond the power of words to describe. Old men and women and little bare-legged children, now and again a boy with a worn soiled uniform, some limping, others wearing an empty sleeve. One thought surged through my mind until it almost sickened me—War.

The land of the war zone must be reclaimed. These acres are needed now more than they were before the war. The world's food supply is low. Miles of trenches must be filled up. Trees must be planted, the ground must be cleared of shells and barbed wire; villages and cities must be rebuilt. The mess must be removed; homes must be restored. It is a big job.

One great misfortune is that although many months have come and gone since the signing of the Armistice no general comprehensive plan of reconstruction has been started. Here and there small sections of the devastated regions are being partly reconstructed. Temporary provision is being made for the homeless. This is all well and good, but intelligent, economical, efficient and

speedy reconstruction demand a general plan and an organization equipped to speedily and completely put it over.

The doing of this work requires vision and capacity for doing large things well. If the physical reconstruction is left to Europe, the work will not be finished in fifty years. Here is a chance for America. We have experience in doing things on a big scale and Europe needs this experience and help. The physical reconstruction of Europe must be done; the sooner the better. And if America is going to help, why not now? It is estimated that it will cost \$13,000,000,000 to reconstruct the North of France.

The reconstruction of the devastated area is after all only a matter of plan, time and money, and notwithstanding the fact that Europe is bankrupt to-day, the money must and will come. The clearing up of the wreckage and the rebuilding is a minor problem compared with the other great and more important question of reconstruction, the reconstruction of industry, the establishment of normal life.

Money is a gross thing when compared with human life. To mention Europe's financial losses in the same breath with the dead and wounded seems sordid yet we live in an every-day world and in it money has its logical place. The economic condition of the world directly affects the people. It determines the kind of lives the people live. It affects happiness. It has to do with security. The war cost \$197,000,000,000. In an economic sense every dollar spent was a waste, a loss. Europe's

debt and her poverty are making new and difficult problems every day.

How will Europe pay? How can she pay? Where can she get the money? These questions are troubling the wisest and most optimistic men.

Europe has borrowed until her interest charge to-day almost equals her income. I heard Lloyd George say that England faced a yearly interest charge of over £300,000,000. Another official told me that this interest which England must pay this year is nearly £100,000,000 larger than the cost of administration before the Boer war. Only the other day her interest was due on some loans from the United States and she defaulted. Our government added the interest to the principal and passed the day of payment on. In the meantime the pound is going down in value, as is the franc, the mark and the lira. When a country buys, and imports, the buyer nation must pay. Payment must be in gold or in things of value. Europe cannot pay in gold, and her disorganized life and her shortage of everything makes it impossible for her to pay in exports. Her imports are increasing daily and her credit is affected, her unpaid bills are piling up and as a consequence the value of her money is declining. Nations are not unlike individuals. When a man continues to make purchases and is unable to pay, his credit suffers. He has nothing of value with which to pay and he gives his note. He continues to buy and gives more notes. The result is that his paper is worthless and less until it has only the value of the paper. This is briefly and simply the story of the exchange

problem. Europe's money is paper, whether it is marks, crowns, francs or kronen, and the nations of Europe, needing things with which to live, continue to buy where they can and are compelled to issue more paper money, and the more paper money issued the cheaper the paper money becomes.

When I was on the continent the English pound, normally worth \$4.85, could be bought for \$4.14. Thereafter it went steadily down. Before the war Great Britain had about \$20,000,000,000 invested throughout the world. The war costs compelled her to dispose of seventy-five per cent of these investments, leaving her with approximately \$5,000,000,000 in outside investments. In 1919, Great Britain's income was two million pounds less per day than its expenditures. The government is under an enormous expense to support the "penny loaf," which costs it about one million pounds a week. Then too she has the expense of maintaining large armies in Ireland, India and Egypt. At this time her internal interest amounts to over thirty-seven million pounds. This does not include the enormous sums annually due abroad. Before the war her interest charge was about £24,500,000. Great Britain faces the problem of paying interest equal to £30 per man against an average earning capacity of £125 per man. When the British ministers balance the budget they are juggling figures—they are causing figures to lie.

Great Britain continues to increase the value of her imports. In 1913 her imports amounted to about \$3,000,000,000, while in 1918 they had increased to \$9,000,-

000,000. This computation in dollars is based on a rate of exchange of \$5 to the pound. If this increase in imports promised an increase in production it would indicate that Great Britain was recovering and would soon be able to increase her exports, thus paying her debts and helping to restore her credit and increase the value of the pound. Unfortunately this is not the fact, as shown by the Board of Trade figures for the first eleven months of 1919. These figures show that while the increase in value of imports has multiplied, yet the actual weight of the imports has decreased; that is, while in 1913 for a similar period the imports were roughly 50,000,000 tons, in 1919 they were only about 35,000,000 tons, a decrease in quantity of 15,000,000 tons, this decrease largely in wood, timber and mineral ores, which are essential to rehabilitate the decay and destruction consequent to war and enable the manufacture of such articles as could be exported to a large extent.

France is in even a worse plight. The banks are loaded with government paper. She has made no provision by taxation to pay her enormous war debt. I was told that any effort to impose a tax in France would bring on a revolution. It is said that her debt has reached the startling figure of \$640 for every man, woman and child in the nation. When I left Cherbourg to sail for America the regulation had been put into effect prohibiting any one leaving France from taking money with him, either metal or paper money, in excess of 1,000 francs, and on that date I could have bought almost nine francs for an American dollar.

France looks to the receipt of the indemnities from Germany to save her from bankruptcy and in this she faces disappointment. Few people in Europe, particularly economists, have ever entertained the hope that Germany could or would pay the huge indemnities fixed by the Peace Conference. Germany's economic condition precludes any such possibility. The attitude of mind of the German people is opposed to any serious effort to comply with the impossible conditions imposed by the Peace Conference. It will do no good to call a man a German sympathizer, because he tells the truth about this matter. Facts are facts and must be faced. It is estimated that Germany is not worth over \$50,000,000,000 and her national indebtedness is about \$55,000,000,000. Germany's future is blighted by a conflict raging between the Prussian militarists who have not given up hope of reëstablishing the old order, and her left wing "Reds," who have caught the fever of Bolshevism and are bent upon ruining Germany in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Italy's national debt is staggering. She faces an increased cost in everything she needs and her credit is practically gone. The cost of coal, and it is an important factor in production, illustrates Italy's problem. Italy formerly imported 11,000,000 tons of coal, costing from twenty to twenty-five lira a ton (four to five dollars). With her present depreciated currency each ton costs now from six hundred to seven hundred lira. Her depreciated currency affects the cost of every commodity

she needs and uses, without which Italy is helpless and her industries are paralyzed.

In Czecho-Slovakia I found a new nation without any gold reserve. The government closed the borders for ten days and commanded the people to bring their paper money to the banks where stamps were put on the bills. When they brought their money they were given fifty per cent of it back, stamped, and receipts for the balance. In this way the government cut down the volume of its paper money fifty per cent. Even after this effort to preserve some value in the kronen, I bought kronens in Prague for less than two cents apiece. The industries of Czecho-Slovakia were working from twenty to twenty-five per cent of their capacity. Men were idle as a result and the government sought to prevent general starvation and revolution, I mean the revolution of idle, hungry, hopeless men, by issuing to them money with which to live. The effect of this is demoralizing. Idle men living from a government gift of money which they had not earned are demoralized. Such a plan quickly takes from men the desire to work. No criticism can be attached to the government, because it was the only thing it could do. Czecho-Slovakia was without credit. It had sought raw materials on time in almost every quarter, and with little success. The gold reserve of the government was beet sugar, and this was mortgaged to a syndicate of Holland-French banks.

In Poland every kind and species of paper money is in circulation. The new Poland is made up of land which before the war formed parts of the Russian, Prussian

and Austro-Hungarian empires. The frontiers of Poland are open. The Peace Table has not fixed them. During the war Russia, Prussia and Austria looted Poland. All the precious metals were stolen, including silver and gold plate. Poland is practically without any gold reserve. Poland was stripped of everything of value and use. Poland's vain struggle to get credit, to keep her people from dying by the millions from hunger and cold, is pitiful.

Austria is penniless, poverty-stricken. Vienna is a city of ghosts, listless, pepless human beings. They drag their feet after them. Their heads are bent on their shoulders. The kronen was worth a cent when I was there. But it mattered little, for there is practically nothing to buy. Austria in her extremity, her people starving, petitioned the Peace Table for the privilege of selling her art treasures. Her plea was to exchange them for bread and coal and her necessity uttered the plea. The Peace Table refused permission, holding that these things of value might be the only collateral out of which the Allies could collect the indemnity.

Europe's debt is her crown of thorns, her dead is her cross; unrest is her Calvary. America is her hope—her resurrection.

PRODUCTION THE FIRST NEED

The world lives by two kinds of work, the work on the soil and the labor spent in making things. In this way we get the things we eat, wear and use. We have eaten up our surplus. The world's reserve is gone. We

are literally living from hand to mouth. To overcome the food shortage we must put every inch of available ground into production. Only by doing this can we live and gradually get back the surplus which stood as a protection against crop failures.

Production is not automatic, it is the work of man. To grow things men must plow and gather. The will to work is our greatest need. The land is available. God furnishes the sunshine and the rain. To get plows, tractors and farm tools we must go to the industrial arm of life. Here again is the call for men. We are short of man power. Men were killed and crippled in the war. The men who survived the war must help do the work that would have been done by those who did not come back. In their present frame of mind they do not will to work, at least under the old conditions obtaining before the war. It is necessary to furnish them with an inducement to work. There was little inducement for men to work before the war. The discontented are not kicking at work. Their objection goes to the unfairness shown in distributing the result. It isn't any secret. They are shouting it from the housetops of Europe, they demand a larger share of the things they produce, or they refuse to work. There is a good deal of human nature in it, too. It is only human nature to think of self. There isn't anything unnatural in the working-man looking for reward. Willingness to work is largely based on the thought of working for oneself.

Five things are necessary to start and keep production going. To get the clothes, coal and comforts of life, to

give the farmer the tools he needs for agricultural production, so that we may eat; to provide the transportation necessary to collection and distribution, to bring the city to the country and the country to the market we must do five essential things.

First, we must have plants, and I use the word in the most general sense. These plants must be equipped with machinery and tools, they must be ready for work.

Second, a plant is useless and stands idle unless we provide raw material, the thing furnished by nature that man and machine work into the finished product.

Third, we must have coal. Coal runs the machine and keeps warm the home of the man who runs the machine. The helplessness of the world without coal is brought home to me while I am writing these articles. The miners have left the pit. The government, through the courts, has tried to force them back. The effort is a failure. The streets are dark at night. The houses are cold. Business is crying out against necessary restrictions imposed because of the coal shortage. I realize as I never have before how dependent we are on the men who pick and dig the coal. All of the intelligence and culture, the courts, the gold, are but symbols of power. When the coal miners folded their hands and set their teeth things stopped.

Fourth, transportation is necessary to the gathering, collecting and delivering of raw material and the distribution of the finished product.

Fifth, and last, but first in importance, is man power. The purpose of production is man. He is master at

every stage, in every department. Without him production is impossible. Employers who proceed on the theory that men could not live without their business, its pay roll, forget the first and greater truth that there would be no business without the workers. Man cuts, digs, gathers and hauls the raw material. He hews the wood, builds the plant. He mines the ore, he makes the tools, the machinery. He oils it, sets it in motion. He runs it. He makes the furnace and the boiler. He digs and shovels the coal which makes the power. He defies the heat of the furnace. He builds the locomotive and pulls its throttle. He makes the freight car and stands in the sleet in the dangerous railroad yard with the signal of safety.

Transportation in Europe is particularly paralyzed. During the war railroad tracks and roadbeds had fallen to pieces. It could not be helped, but the fact that it was unavoidable doesn't alter the situation. Roadbed and rails have fallen to pieces. There is a terrible shortage of cars. Everywhere on the Continent this is felt. They have less than a third of the rolling stock necessary to meet normal requirements. The demand for transportation facilities will necessarily increase during the period of reconstruction. I have seen locomotives sneezing, coughing, expiring every few miles. Old, broken-down engines, the kind one expects to find in a museum. I was on a de luxe train, a diplomatic express. I commented upon the condition of the locomotive, which came to a full stop every few miles. The chief of the train looked

at me, smiled and said: "If you think this one is bad you ought to see some of the others."

The war disarranged plants and factories. The demand was for munitions. Equipment efficient for peace production gave way to plant construction necessary to manufacture the weapons of war. Plants were commandeered. Machinery was torn out, new machinery put in. A complete reconstruction and reorganization was effected. It is necessary to change these plants back and fit them for the production needed. It is expensive, it takes time, it retards production.

It is strange that, while every one can see and understand the difficulties and delays incident to reorganizing and rearranging machinery and plants, many people cannot see or understand the problem of rearranging men's lives, who for four years have been living abnormally. The effect of the war upon plants and equipment is conceded by the very man who refused to see any effect of the war on the men who were in it.

During the war women answered the roll-call. They left their homes and went to work. There is hardly any class of work that I can think of that I have not seen women doing in Europe. I have seen them loading boats, shoveling coal, washing windows, driving wagons, cleaning streets, conductors on trams. Many of the women who went into the industries were young women. Now that the war is over and the men have come back there is a demand on the part of the men that the women return to their homes. This is impossible in many cases, for these women have grown dependent upon their jobs

for their living. Some employers of labor have taken advantage of the situation. They pay a woman less money than they pay a man for the same work. This makes both dissatisfied. The woman has the sympathy of the working man. He doesn't want her to compete with him to the extent that his wages will be lowered, neither does he want the boss to discriminate against her.

Women have come into the world of work to stay. If there is any meaning in the phrase "class conscious," they are living examples of it. They are more outspoken about their demands than men. They sense a wrong long before a man can see it. They have brought their intuition into the labor world. They are more radical than men, and they stimulate men to action. They have brought to the labor problem a new and interesting angle.

The key to the future is in the hands of these men and women. Production is the door that must be opened. Men and women must work, or winter and want will make a No Man's Land of Europe before the autumn of 1920.

Children crying for bread, shivering in the cold, are praying that men will work when they pray to God for food and warmth. Their help cries are smothered by a great blanket—unrest. Will men hear them?

CHAPTER III

THE WILL TO WORK

THE most obvious thing in Europe is the changed attitude of the people. And yet there are many, particularly in the conservative employing group, who refuse to see; there are none so blind as these. While they close their eyes and minds, the change goes on. It is not just rhetoric to write that new forces are at work. Of course one cannot see the forces any more than he can see the grass growing. But one can see the result; it is possible to measure and analyze the effects.

Everywhere I have heard people talking about a "New Order." Men separated by hundreds of miles were thinking and talking the same ideas. It startled me to discover that the speech in the Slav countries was addressed to the same theme, and largely from the same point of view I had heard in England and France. I did not meet any one who was able to give me a clear, complete meaning of the phrase "New Order," but I found it on the lips of almost every one. It has a meaning and time will furnish a plan. The people are looking ahead waiting for something to happen, expecting better lives. They have faith that this New Order will come, and that in it they will find the dreamed-of free-

dom. The people seem confident that some vital compensation must and will come out of the siege of suffering through which the world has passed. If they were not so earnest and yet so sane, so intent and still so calm about it, I should have interpreted their speech as fanaticism.

A meaningless minority of reactionaries scorn all talk of a New Order. They are the backward-looking men of big business, the stand-patters in politics. They are out of touch with the times, out of sympathy with the people. They think the world is the little circle in which they live. They are the barnacles on big business. They smugly set down all talk of "change" as Bolshevism. Fortunately the real leaders of business are breaking away from this past-tense point of view. The progressive, humane and open-minded business men see and know that unrest is a pressing problem and that it must be solved, and they are giving heed to the complaints of the workers; they are giving thought to the problem. A former narrow-mindedness which shut out the point of view of the worker and ignored it, is passing. Some of the advocates of the truth, that there is justice back of the complaint of the workers, are large employers of labor. Instead of arguing coercion these men are talking concession. They recognize the change that has come over the people and they want to meet it, not with force but humanely and justly and with understanding. A New Order will come. The dawn of the new day has broken. No one can halt time and keep this day from being realized. The one question bothering the minds of

men awake to the change is, will it come through revolution or through evolution? The greatest friend of revolution is the stubborn employer who refuses to admit that a new day has come to the world, but insists things must remain as they have been and relies upon the use of force to put down unrest. He is unconscious of the fact that he is stimulating and aggravating unrest. He sees the "Red" in Bolshevism, but he does not see the "yellow" in himself. He knows that work alone will save us, that without it there can be no production; but he does not realize that unrest is killing the will to work.

We live by work; prosperity and production are synonyms. World poverty is nothing more nor less than under production—not having enough of the things needed for the world's life. Stripping economics of all its high-sounding jargon, the naked truth is that the world has only the things it works to produce.

It may not be amiss to state a few facts known by everybody which tell in terms of meaning a simple fundamental truth in economics. We live on the earth. It is land and water; in the ground are minerals. The land grows crops, and we need the minerals that are in the ground, but the soil will not grow crops nor will the ground yield minerals without man's labor. We must live and we must have food and all the fertile soil in the world means nothing until it is cultivated and crops planted and harvested by the work of man. We must have clothing, houses in which to live, transportation and the thousand and one other things which make up the needs of the world, and we cannot get any of these ex-

cept through work. When little work is done we have a shortage of everything. There is not enough food to go around, and some must go hungry, others must starve. There are not enough clothes, enough coal, and many people are cold, others freeze, some are ragged, others are naked. Everything by which we live is the result of work. Stop work and you stop the supply, and poverty and misery follow.

To understand Europe's condition to-day one must stop and realize that the war interrupted production. Nearly 60,000,000 men answered the call to arms and for four years these men were withdrawn from factories, farms, mines and mills. Their labor power was lost to the world. If 60,000,000 men went on a strike for four years the world would understand the enormous loss of such a withdrawal of labor from industry and agriculture. Conceive if you can of the pile of manufactured goods and of food that would have been produced by their toil. But the mobilizing of the armies of the world has had a more serious effect upon production than such a strike would have had. In a strike men merely stop producing and the world is compelled to adopt every economy. Most important is the fact the mobilized men were not idle, they were engaged in destruction. From an economic point of view the war was a strike, plus.

The present growing illness of the world is not incurable. There is a remedy and it can be written in a single word. The prescription is "work." Every effort should be made to inspire every man with the will to work. Force and intolerance are not inspirational. Men

cannot be made to work. No employer should contribute to unrest and provoke idleness by refusing to negotiate with his men, and into the negotiations he should bring a friendly spirit, a sense of fairness, an open-mindedness, a willingness to compromise. Justice should be the objective, and to reach it, it is necessary for the employer and worker alike to dispassionately examine their differences. The employer who meets labor with the thought in his mind that he is better equipped to fight than labor is because he has a surplus, which labor has not, and can eat and be warm while the workers who have been living from hand to mouth will starve, is not only short-sighted, he is, without knowing it, using the tactics and methods of the Bolsheviks. He had better get the idea out of his head that men can be starved into submission. There was a day when this was true, but that day has passed never to return. The man, who depends upon his ability to turn a key in the factory door or shut down the mine and go off on a vacation, imposing his will on his workmen, will recall that the late autocrat of Potsdam, now of Holland, was prevented from doing this very thing to the world, and by the very men then in khaki, now in overalls, who are his workmen.

One thing that some people do not seem to realize is that the men who fought the world's fight for freedom are the same men who are now complaining that they are not getting a square deal. These men and their complaint are at the bottom of the present world unrest. Who were the overwhelming majority of the volunteers and conscripted men whose numbers ran into millions, who went

to the front for civilization? They are the farm hands, the clerks, the teamsters, the millworkers, the men in the factories and shops, the coal miners, the men who operate the trains and swing the signal lanterns in the switch yards. These are the center of the labor problem.

Mr. Employer, you are dealing with ex-soldiers. Do not forget it. They fought for you, for all of us. You would not have your business to-day if it had not been for them, and when you think of the bond you bought, remember the blood they gave.

ON THE TRAIL OF WORLD UNREST

One thought is arousing Europe from the stupor of her misery. She opens her eyes in wide amazement when noting the change in her children. It is puzzling her, although she knows what they have gone through, how patiently and uncomplainingly they suffered. When she remembers the peace of the years before the war, the sane lives they lived, and then recalls the four years in which they wallowed in wet, foul sewers called trenches, slept in tombs on the edge of a strip of hell called No Man's Land, breathed the smell of burning flesh, saw their pals "go west," buried their dead, grinned at pain, laughed at death; it is not strange that they have changed. Nerves of steel could not stand what they went through.

The men have put on mufti again. It is strange to them. The quiet streets are dull. The demobilized soldier feels the let-down. The tenseness over, depression sets in. During the war he did not have time to think

of much except the job ahead of him. Every minute, every move was life or death. Now for the first time he realizes what he has gone through, wonders why he is alive. Two thoughts possess him; one, the memory of every minute of the days and nights of the war—the other, what is ahead, what is he going to do with his life! He is at the crossroads. The word "job" doesn't mean much to him. It is not that he is lazy, but he has to pinch himself to realize that it is over and that he is back from the war.

Between the whizz of machine bullets and the shriek of shrapnel he spent his time thinking, and his thoughts were not all about the war. He never got used to the war, but he learned to forget it. He has brought more than souvenirs and memories from his experience. He has brought home thoughts, ideas and ambitions from the trenches. Many a night, looking over No Man's Land, listening to the "banshee" of the war, he thought and resolved that if he ever came back he wanted, and would have, a better chance in this queer thing called Life. He feels that he has paid for a place. And he has paid. He has earned the right to a decent place in the world, for which he fought. He helped save the world and he looks to that world to save him from a meaningless machine existence. If it fails him he has made up his mind to use force. He is willing to work, wants to work, but he insists on being part of his work, rather than his work being all of him. He sees, feels and measures things from an intensely human angle. He feels his humanness. The war emphasized the value and

meaning of the human being. It was life or death. He is alive. He wants a human interest in his work.

Demobilized soldiers in different parts of Europe, in different languages, are saying:

If the world isn't going to give us a better chance than it gave us before the war, then the world wasn't worth fighting for. When we fought, they told us it was to make the world safe for democracy and to make life worth while. We thought this meant us and ours. We have learned that life isn't only a question of a job and enough to eat, we want to be treated like human beings. A man wants to feel that his work means more to him than just wages. He spends most of his time at work, the rest of it is spent with his family and in sleeping so he will be able to work the next day. Why shouldn't he have an interest in the business, and why shouldn't the business have an interest in him? We don't want to run the business, all we ask is a say in it, a friendly say in it. Some people think that to be fed is to be free—it isn't. Being free means being treated like a human being.

I have found many decent honest men and women who have lost interest in work. They say, "We don't get a fair share of what we make. We fight among ourselves for jobs because we have to or starve, and they pay us as little as they can." I am not reasoning or arguing this question. I am merely stating a fact which indicates the state of mind of millions of men and women in Europe who during the past four years did their bit for civilization.

Calling these people Bolsheviks doesn't silence them nor solve the problem. Such tactics irritate and deepen the unrest. Their grievance must be given a fair, patient

hearing. Their attitude of kind must be reckoned with if we hope to get back to normal living. I have heard it said that these people must be made to understand that it is work or starve. No law or government in the world is powerful enough to compel people to work. To think of using force is foolish, suicidal.

We have had enough force during the last four years and the farther we get away from the idea of beating one another into submission the better off we shall be. The present unrest is positively dangerous. It isn't like any other unrest. There is no precedent. It is the restlessness of human beings who have been face to face with death. We need calmness and common sense. Of one thing I am sure, and that is, if an effort is made to use blind, brute force on the working people of the world, the present unrest will be set in motion, a whirlwind will break upon the world.

The open road to happiness is coöperation. If we stop for a moment and realize what we have been through, and the changes that through it have come upon us, we will find getting together easy. Unrest blocks the road. It fetters the will to work. We must face the truth, and the sooner we do so the better. The war has bankrupted Europe. One thing, and one thing only, will bring us back to sane, normal living. It is work. Sympathy and understanding will do more to secure peace and stimulate work, than defiance, challenge and threats.

A normal world is one in which men live and work, where all men have a chance to be happy, an interest in work, a joy in working—living to work, rather than

working to live. Men must have food, clean wholesome food, and enough of it to do their work without exhaustion. Men must have clothes. Not only to protect their bodies from the weather, but clothes that satisfy the normal instinct for cleanliness and neatness. Decent clothes sustain self-respect.

There must be a time between the end of the day and the beginning of sleep in which men can know and enjoy their families. The man who is so used up by his day's work that he falls asleep at his supper table isn't playing fair with his wife and children, and his employer isn't playing fair with him. All men are boys, even after they have gray hair. This quality is probably the finest and best in them. They need a playtime, a recreation time. When they do not get it, they lose something and the world loses more. It is not enough that bodies are fed, minds must also be fed. Light is the right of every human being with eyes. Education is light. The human race must have light. Children are entitled to a school time, a jump-the-rope time, a top time, a play time. A child who enters manhood or womanhood without ever having known a childhood goes through life with something missing, something lost. The creed of the changed world is that while the world doesn't owe any one a living, it is obligated to give every human being a chance to make a decent living. The new commandment is that this chance must be given. These were some of the thoughts I found planted in the unrest in Europe. They are strongly, deeply rooted in the consciousness of the people and they are growing. Men and women are gar-

dening, cultivating, protecting these ideas. Any effort to uproot or destroy these flowering thoughts will be resented and fought by the gardeners. They are not weed thoughts—they are the blooms of hope and they belong to the poor. They will fight and die before they will see these hope growths trampled under foot. This is the only garden they have. The blood of the dead fertilized it. The living care for it.

CHAPTER IV

UNREST BEFORE THE WAR WAS AN ACORN,
TO-DAY IT IS AN OAK

A SPECTER haunts Europe. It is the ghost of unrest. When I started out to interview unrest in Europe I did not give ear to the idle theorist who always knows all about everything, but never from direct experience, nor did I go to the agitator who preaches unrest in "Red" words. I did not seek out the type of fanatical labor leader, who, eager for trouble, is trying to mobilize unrest and marshal it under the banner of Revolution. I passed over the place-hunting, time-serving politician. I was not interested in platitudes and promises.

I sought knowledge of unrest from those who knew it by actual contact. I went to the man in the street, the average man. I talked with the blackened coal miner at the mouth of the shaft. He had just come from his day of darkness in the ground. I visited the man who works in the mills. I listened to the speech of the teamster. I went to factories and talked with men between the two whistles which mark the time of the noon meal. They munched at black bread, ate cheese or sausage, gulped tea, coffee or cheap, diluted red wine. I spent time with the idle, the idle by choice as well as those who through

no fault of their own were without work. Only yesterday, most of these men were in khaki; now, back on the job in overalls, they were thinking. Their speech was troubled. Discontent looked out from their eyes. I could feel the undercurrent of unrest. They talked it, never as unrest, always protest.

Unrest is epidemic; it is militant. Unrest is real, it has cause. To get close to the cause of this disease which threatens revolution, one must understand what is going on in the minds of the men upon whom the world's work is depending. Heed must be given to the things irritating them, and a remedy found for the irritation, otherwise serious trouble will follow. While "war is hell" it has at least the restraint of discipline. A revolution growing out of unrest would mean mob madness, terrorism—fanatical, brutal, cruel and merciless. Once started it would ignite the world, and the fire would run its course until there was nothing left to burn. Who dares picture the state in which it would leave the world? In this day, when the nerves of mankind are on edge, when cold and hunger incite to destruction, one shudders to think of the fate of civilization if unrest is not checked before it explodes its passion and wrath.

Unrest existed before the war. Then an acorn, it is now an oak. Before the war men were complaining, and justly, about their lot, but four years in the trenches caused them to stop complaining and act. Soldiering taught them much. They learned of the greatness of force; to-day, they demand, and back of their demand is the full grown grievance and the war lesson.

Plain average men have always been intensely human. Loving their wives and children, they lived for their homes, and felt keenly their responsibility for the happiness of the loved ones. They have but one thing to give. Before the war they gave it unsparingly; it was their labor. Their one source of income was the pay envelope. With their wages they had to buy shoes, clothes, food, and provide shelter for the lives they brought into the world, and for the women they had chosen to be the mothers of those children.

"Home, Sweet Home," is the world's anthem. It is the heart song of the average man. From his home he goes to work, and from work he goes home, but shanties and tenements are not homes. These men have always protested against the ugly shacks in which they were compelled to house their families. They bit their lips in jobless days when their children went to bed hungry. Resentment grew in their hearts when they saw how poorly dressed their wives and little ones were, and they muttered curses when their children were forced to work. They had hoped their children would have a better education than they had had, and a better chance in life.

As these men grew older their families grew in size and wants, while their ability to earn decreased. The tragedy registered in their pay envelopes. They were being ground between growing needs and diminishing wages. The grinding hurt their bodies and furrowed their brains.

They lived in dread of poverty. It had been their nurse, they feared it would be their pallbearer. Poverty

had taken its revenge upon them. They were resolving it should not put its lash upon their children. They knew poverty intimately. It wasn't a word, a name; it was a living, hateful, cruel companion. It was the evil that recruited the Marys of Scarlet Hall, the Magdalenes of the slums, and always the army was mobilized from the homes of the poor. Girls who had been robbed of their youth, who had never owned a flower, poorly fed and miserably clad, dragged out of bed by alarm clocks, sounding the call to toil, when they should have been answering the school bell, children physically unfit for the breadwinner's struggle, children without the moral endurance necessary for the life fight, were driven into "No Woman's Land," the rotten scum under the world.

Before the war men were brooding on these things. Papers, books, magazines, mirroring life, pictured these horrors. Men returning from a hard day's work talked these things over with their wives after the children had gone to bed, and many a man left his supper table to peek through the half-closed door into a room where his "kiddies" were sleeping, tiptoeing back, only to look into the eyes of a mother, and see reflected there the fears he felt.

The invention of the typesetting machine, the manufacture of cheap paper, the growth of public school systems, and public libraries, brought an ever increasing light to the minds of workmen. They saw more clearly their needs and more completely realized their rights. They saw that education is the light in the road. They sought to make haste, to make up for lost time. Educa-

tion taught them to want things for themselves and their families of which their fathers and mothers had never thought. The homes which satisfied their parents depressed and irritated them. The bathtub and tooth brush are acquired habits. The desire to straighten the back that has been bent in toil too long, is put there by education.

One thing stood in the way—obstructing the path to decent living—Poverty. They saw this impassable obstacle was the result of poor wages. They saw more. They saw that poor wages built the poorhouses and filled them, organized the bread lines, introduced the soup house. Out of their thoughts, and from their experience they carved a truth. As long as some people have more than they can possibly use, while others through no fault of their own have less than they absolutely need, something is wrong.

When the call to arms came these thoughts were living in the mass mind of the world.

A PRIMARY CAUSE OF UNREST

Not many years ago something happened which materially changed the relations between employer and employee, and this happening has had a marked effect upon industrial discontent. Something was lost. The human element, the personal touch, between the boss and the workers stopped. With its passing unrest grew with great vigor. A new kind of unrest which resolved itself into a lasting, determined, resolute discontent. It came with the passing of the small business.

In the day of the small plant, business was owned and run by a man, or a number of men in partnership. These men lived in the community in which their men lived. They worked with their men. In the front of the plant was the office of the "boss." He was on the job. He wasn't a hired boss, either—he was the real boss—the owner. The sign under which the business was run bore his name. It identified him with the business. The boss had his home in the city in which the plant was located. His children went to the school, frequently the school to which the children of his workmen went. If he was a church-going man—and generally he was—he and his family went on Sunday to the same church that his men and their families attended. The men who worked for him knew him, at least to the extent of recognizing him when they saw him. He knew many of them, personally and by name. Few people realized then how much this meant to the maintenance of harmonious relations in the industrial world. When working men had a grievance, or thought they had, they took it directly to the boss. He discussed it with them. He was reasonable and fair. If the complaint was well founded it was given consideration; a remedy was found. The working man was satisfied. He had had his way. He was treated as a human being. He felt he was part of the business, so did the boss.

In the day of small business, the owner of a factory or plant who paid his men an unliving wage was a marked man in the community. Public opinion chastised him for his selfishness and inhumanity. The people

said he was a sweater, a slave driver, and held him in contempt. They contrasted his good clothes, the style of his family and his fine mansion, with the rags his working men wore, the hovels in which they lived. He was pointed out, hated, despised. The thought of the community was that it would be better for him and his to give up some of their excess luxury and afford the men living wages. Disgrace fell not only upon his head, but followed his wife and children. When they went to church they were regarded as hypocrites; people knew that every day in the week he was insulting the Christ he pretended to worship on the Sabbath. Few men are so thick-skinned as not to feel the lash of public opinion. It isn't easy to bear the hate of one's neighbors, and it is natural for men to want the good opinion of their fellows. In the day of small business, public opinion held a lash over the inhuman and greedy, and kept hirers of men human. But the small employer was doomed.

The partnership passed off the stage and with it the personal touch between employer and employees. The corporation, a soulless body, was born of the law. It absorbed small plants and small businesses. It collected under a single roof thousands of men. The corporation, the combination, the trust had come. This new order of doing business on a large scale was efficient—economical. It eliminated waste and duplication. It was a great, smooth-running machine. It represented progress in doing the world's work.

The corporation name did not disclose the owners of Big Business. It was an impersonal, inhuman thing.

Frequently the stockholders did not live in the cities where the plants were located. The real owners were unknown to employees and public. Many of the large shareholders had never seen the plant. The men who worked in the plants had never seen the men for whom they worked. The man actually running the business was only an employee. He was paid a large salary and it was made plain to him when he was hired that his salary and his job depended on his ability to make profits. The corporation was organized for millions of dollars. The manager was expected to make dividends. The larger the dividend checks, the higher he was rated. His tenure of job and salary were measured by this definition of success. To make profits it is necessary to keep down the cost of production. The principal item in the cost of production is the labor charge, the wages of the men. The employee-manager was obliged to set himself to his task. One object, one thought, was always before him —keep down wages. He drilled this idea into his staff, his superintendents and his foremen. The first commandment of Big Business to the manager was "make dividends or quit."

These large industrial corporations were very frequently overcapitalized. A corporation representing an actual investment of \$10,000,000 was organized for \$50,000,000. It did not take a financier to see that \$40,000,000 of its capitalization was wind, water, fake—a lie. The law that gave the corporation a right to exist forgot to keep it under control. The stock was sold, the shares representing fiction as well as those representing value.

The Captain of Industry spoke of the \$40,000,000 of overcapitalization as a "melon." The law should have written it down as larceny. The selling of this stock was nothing more or less than obtaining money under false pretenses. When a working man obtained bread under false pretenses he was sent to jail. When honest men cried out against this grand larceny they were called "muckrakers," agitators, and charged with provoking unrest, and disturbing business. If this did not silence them, paid publicity told the world that the stock was held by widows and orphans; that the attacks upon it were efforts to rob them.

The state, the law and the government had given dollars the right to organize. A corporation is a union of dollars, exactly as organized labor is a union of men. The men organized as a matter of self-defense. They knew the individual no longer had a chance to register his complaint with the owner and that as an individual the worker was utterly meaningless in such a large scheme. When he complained he was told, "Take things as they are, stop whining; if you don't like your job, quit. There are thousands of men waiting to step into your shoes."

One of the first things the corporation did was to deny to men the right the law gave them—the right to organize. In defiance of their attitude the men did organize and forged the strike as a weapon with which to fight for their rights. The law had not kept pace with the times. It failed to furnish protection. It neglected to provide a reasonable control over these powerful combinations.

Workingmen asked for the privilege of collective bargain—it was a simple request, a just one; its meaning was clear. The men wanted the right to appoint a committee to represent them and discuss with the men who hired them the terms of employment. The directors, generally men who never saw the plant, telegraphed the employee boss a command to refuse the demand for collective bargaining. There was only one reply the men could make. They made it. It was force—the strike. The last twenty-five years have been filled with strikes, which created waste and caused hate, which grew out of the refusal of Big Business to concede to men a right the law conferred on it, the right to organize.

When the cost of living forced men to ask for an increase in wages they were often met with the answer, "We can't afford it." The workers could not afford to work longer for the wages they were getting, because they were unable to make both ends meet. The pay envelope was not large enough. The men pointed to the fact that the answer given by capital was not true. To show their good faith the capitalists told the general public, "We are only making three per cent on our capital; men who loan money get five per cent." They did not tell the people they were receiving three per cent on \$50,000,000, while the real capital invested was only \$10,000,000. The sweat of men was being used to pay dividends on \$40,000,000 of stock. If the dividends earned were distributed over the capital actually invested, \$10,000,000, the profits would have been shown in their true light. The reasonableness of the demand of the men

would have been disclosed. It was a case of crooked capitalization, lying to protect its ill-gotten gains. Big Business needs ethics—Captains of Industry need ideals.

The law left the men helpless. They had only one course—Fight, Strike! Strikes cause great public inconvenience. The people smarting under hardships condemn and blame the strikers. Strikes have another effect that is even worse. They harden hate into a concrete class feeling. Strikes are responsible for the attitude of mind of many working men to-day who say, "I will do as little work as possible for the money I get." It is a vicious circle of hate.

Coöperation is made impossible, confidence is destroyed, trust is killed; the chasm between employer and employee is widened and deepened. A final consequence of these physical and psychological effects is the tendency towards riot. The strike is the training school. It creates idleness, hunger, irritation, disregard for law, which, when combined and concentrated, make revolutions.

The seed of unrest is planted.

THE WAR TAUGHT THE LESSON OF FORCE

Making a soldier out of a civilian does more than change the clothes he wears. It changes the man. Men who had never owned a revolver or rifle, who had never even shot one, who had never killed anything in their lives, were given firearms. They were drilled, taught to shoot, taught to kill. The education was thorough and scientific. They learned to look down the sight of a

rifle, pick out a human head for a target, fire and eagerly watch for the man to fall. They were trained to rush madly at a wall of human beings and drive bayonets into men's heads and bowels. Many of these men a few years before would have fainted in a stockyard where cattle were being killed. For four years they have been in a human slaughterhouse, not only as spectators, but as part of the place. It steeled them and made them immune. Many of them contracted the undertaker's point of view towards life, a fatalism without fear.

Experience in battle taught them the meaning of the word "force." They discovered that the individual was only important and efficient when he acted in concert with a group. Everything depended upon team work. Men learned that a group of men working in harmony, with nerve and rifles, with fixed bayonets, could do wonderful things. They could take an objective. In other words, take the thing they wanted and needed. When these men came back into civil life, took off their khaki and put on overalls, the taking off of the khaki and the putting on of working clothes did not erase from their minds the lessons the war had taught.

This lesson has borne fruit. The men look at the employer as an enemy. The employer thinks of them as a commodity. Hatred is cordial. The men want something. They demand it. The employer refuses. Their objective is to get the thing they want and need. The war taught them that there is a way, a weapon—Force. To-day in Europe men reason, "If we can't get what we want, and need, we must take it. We have the force."

Having grown habituated to suffering, accustomed to blood and death, they look with indifference on the question of danger, of price. They saw that when nations could not agree they resorted to force. They discovered that victory generally went to the nation possessing the greatest force.

In the labor movement of Europe we have this idea in what is called "direct action." "Direct action" is nothing more or less than applying war methods to peace conditions. They seek to secure their objective by force. No allowance is made for the fact that methods necessary in war are not justifiable in peace.

Many men got, while in the army, their first taste of fresh air and decent food. Very properly the allied governments gave the best of everything to the men in the armies. It isn't difficult to get accustomed to good food and fresh air; it is hard to go back to poor food and the tenements. Back home, many of the demobilized soldiers are not eating as well or as much as they ate during their service. Despite the rigid discipline of army life, men are treated as men. The humblest man in the ranks has rights that must be respected. This is not always the case in civil life. Then, too, while in uniform the private was made much of. He was looked upon as one of his country's heroes.

Since the war ended he has been demobilized, forgotten and neglected. This has soured him. He resents it. Social distinction has come back. Now he is only a working man.

Another cause of unrest among the workingmen of

Europe grows also out of the war. Mobilization took millions of men from their jobs. A great shortage of labor resulted. Employers competed with one another to get men. The usual competition was among men to get jobs. The law of supply and demand affected the labor market, wages went up. The soldier went off to war. While he was in the trenches the wages back home were high. His pay was small. Our fighting men were not interested in pay. They went to fight for a principle.

With the coming of peace a large quantity of labor was dumped upon the market. The demobilized men rushed for employment. Comrades in arms became competitors for jobs. The same old law of supply and demand started wages in Europe tobogganing. The number of men who wanted jobs was much greater than the number of places available. The returning soldier seeking a job was offered a much smaller wage than he knew was paid for the same work while he had been fighting. It incensed him. He figured that he had given four years out of his life, had come home tired and broke. He looked upon the decline in wages as a positive discrimination against him.

Everywhere I have heard these men say:

We are out of luck. The bands played and we were applauded when we left to fight. While we were gone wages went up. We don't begrudge the men who stayed at home the wages they got, but it's damned funny that when we come back, down go wages. The cost of living don't go down. I guess we're out of luck.

I found two phrases inseparable in the speech of the discontented, "the high cost of living" and "the profiteer." Workingmen with whom I talked, freely admitted that some of the high cost of living was the legitimate result of the great demand for everything and the natural shortage, but in the same breath they insisted that much of it was due to the mercenary, ghoulish profiteer.

The profiteer took blood money during the world's greatest tragedy. He exacted usury from the toiler at home and the fighting man at the front. He drew dividends out of the tears and wails of broken-hearted women and fright-stricken children. He minted his gold out of agony, starvation, heartaches. He stands to-day the Judas of the war, the most despised man of earth.

The profiteer is not an Englishman, a Frenchman, Italian nor an American. He is found in every country of the world, a man without nationality, without conscience, without humanity. He is the pimp of civilization, and is still on the job. The profiteer has blackened the reputation of America.

A common comment of Europe is, "The United States made money out of the war." These people do not refer to the money made legitimately. They point to the fact, a fact given great publicity in Europe, that in August, 1914, there were about 7,000 American millionaires; while at the time of the signing of the Armistice it was estimated "the millionaire colony had increased by 23,000, making a total of 30,000 millionaires in the United States."

Under date of November 17, 1919, J. S. Bache & Co., members of the New York Stock Exchange, in their financial letter said, "In mercantile circles there is proceeding, at the present time, a vast amount of speculation on a very large scale in commodities. An incident is cited to us of one concern that is carrying \$15,000,000 worth of vegetable oils, which are in great demand, and the concern is holding them for higher prices. This is a distinct damage to the consumers, and keeps living prices in these things, used daily, at top and increasing levels. Speculation of this kind is a real detriment to the community." It is only a sample of the profiteer's work.

The pair of shoes the workingman once bought for \$3.50 are now \$8 and \$10. It is true that the cost of labor and material have gone up, but not enough to warrant any such exorbitant prices. Some business men have taken advantage of the situation, and justify their larcenies on the ground of the law of supply and demand. A shoe man with a prominent Chicago firm, a man long in the business, told me that the present unwarranted and outrageous price of shoes was due to the fact that American shoe manufacturers could get almost any price for shoes from the barefooted people of Europe.

Governments are blamed for not dealing with this species of holdup. No wonder the discontented ask, "Why isn't profiteering treason—why shouldn't these 'Fagins' be sent to the wall with a firing squad as an escort?"

The profiteer is still on the job.

He is holding up the world, a stricken world.

CHAPTER V

A TRAGEDY OF POLITICS

EUROPE was succumbing to exhaustion when the war came to an end. The terrible waste was telling. Endurance had reached the breaking point. With peace there came the one thought. There must be no more war. The men who did the fighting voiced it loudest.

"I'm glad I had a chance to do my part—I wouldn't have missed the 'show' for a million dollars, and I wouldn't take a million dollars to go through it again," is the way they put it. Everywhere in Europe one heard, "It is over, it is finished, thank God."

The first thought of reconstruction was a plan to make peace permanent.

The laboratory and the machine shop gave to this war their terrible new agencies to kill and maim men. There had been invented liquid fire, mustard gas, high explosives, bombs from the clouds, torpedoes from the sea depths. The world was horror stricken. The length of the conflict, the number of dead and crippled, the raiding and bombing of defenseless cities taught the world that an end must be put to war if civilization is to live.

So the people, particularly the working people, took

heart when a League of Nations was suggested as a means of enforcing peace. They placed their hopes in it. They had suffered most from the war. The dead were largely their dead. The returning cripples were blood of their blood. As they put it, they were from their class. Of course the sons of the other class fought, shared the hardships, paid the price, but they were comparatively few. The group from which they came is small, while the toll of casualties from labor's ranks is large.

Controversies between nations have always been inevitable. In the absence of some scheme of arbitration there was but one way that these controversies could be settled. It was force—War.

It is common for individuals to have serious differences of opinion. Every lawsuit, and there are thousands of them in every city of every country, represents a difference of opinion. If we did not have courts providing a peaceful determination of these disputes, the litigants would be compelled to settle their differences by force. Assault and battery would succeed orderly procedure. Nations have been without a peaceful means of adjusting their difficulties, and as a consequence they have been compelled to resort to force.

The peace conference met in Paris. Labor watched it. At an early stage in its proceedings, intrigue was discovered. Wrangling, bickering, bargaining and trading for commercial advantage occupied the time and thought that the world expected would be devoted to the building up of a league that would at least decrease

the chances of future wars. Statesmen in their blind devotion to expediency lost sight of the great reason for the conference. They talked of boundary lines, discussed frontiers, and always from the point of view of financial and military advantage to their respective countries. It was noticed that the territories over which they quarreled were rich in minerals or some other products of great commercial advantage. They squabbled over spoils. Then, too, these men who were supposed to be concerned in the future peace of the world, in arguing over frontiers urged their claims on the grounds that their respective countries needed these frontiers to make them secure in future wars. What future wars and why the discussion of future wars at a conference, the object of which was future peace?

Working men watched, listened and thought. They construed these bickerings and wranglings as evidence of the fact that there is an interest in the world which does not believe in giving up force. I am only reporting the truth when I add they suspect this interest is Capital.

If the League of Nations fails this suspicion will be confirmed. The movement toward an internationalism of the workers will be given great impetus. The League of Nations failing, they argue there is only one other means of preventing war. It is for the men who make up the rank and file of the armies in time of war, the millions recruited from shops, factories and fields, to get together and organize an international labor authority to save the working men from war. Such a movement would take away from governments an important and

necessary function and give to one class in the world a power so great that political governments would be puppets in their hands, and yet in the light of the happenings of the last five years labor should not be blamed. The world is entitled to protection against such slaughter as it has just gone through, and if the political governments fail to take the necessary steps the plain people will.

Internationalism is coming—in fact, it is already here. Inventions have brought the people of the world closer together. The wireless and the cable give us the happenings of remote parts of the world in a few hours. Distance has been destroyed. We are becoming neighbors in knowledge of each other, whether we live on the same continent or not. Modern transportation is shortening the time between places. An air service is in prospect which promises to make London as near New York tomorrow as Chicago is to-day.

We already have successful internationalism in finance and credits. Big business long ago obliterated national lines. The commerce of the world is organized internationally.

The important question is: What form will the new internationalism take? Will it be an internationalism of organized dollars? If so, the world is in serious danger of a financial autocracy. Will it be an internationalism of organized labor? This means the dictatorship of the proletariat. Both are equally undesirable. No part of the people should be permitted to enforce their will upon the rest. One kind of slavery is as bad as another. The great majority of the human race wants freedom, not

advantage. It is not ambitious to dictate—it will not brook dictation.

A League of Nations is the solution. It is a union of the nations of the world, and as the nations of the world represent all the people of the various states such a combination is democratic. That it is necessary is plain. Rivalry for markets, competition for trade, are bound to lead to war unless there is an agreement that these and other problems will be submitted to arbitration. It is not necessary to submit questions involving national honor. Few of such questions ever directly provoke war. It is when nations fighting each other for markets reach a point of positive disagreement that they begin calling each other names. These insults wound honor, war results.

A League of Nations is a continuance of the peace table, and notwithstanding the wranglings of the peace table there would have been war in Europe before this if it had not been sitting in Paris. Two cases serve to illustrate. The coal fields of upper Galicia, to be determined by the plebiscite between Poland and Germany, would have been a cause of war if the peace table had not been in existence. Poland had troops on the border. Germany had her soldiers at the frontier. One thing, and one thing alone, prevented war—it was the fear of the peace table. The same facts described the controversy between Poland and Czecho-Slovakia; war was avoided by the peace table submitting the Teschen question to a vote of the people of the territory.

No League of Nations which does not include the

United States will have much effect upon the future peace of Europe. The nations of Europe distrust each other, but each one respects the fact that the United States does not seek territory in Europe. This gives America the commanding place. With this moral force we can do much to maintain the peace of the world.

The propaganda of revolution coming out of Bolshevik Russia, urging the workers to organize an international dictatorship of the proletariat and seize the world, is not nearly as dangerous to the peace of the world as the political heckling against the League of Nations.

The Bolsheviks are the sworn enemies of the League of Nations. In their proclamation calling the first Congress of the Communist International, afterwards known as the Third International, issued on February 24, 1919, the Soviet government called the proletariat of all countries to oppose any League of Nations, saying, "The danger is that this revolution may be killed by the resistance of the capitalistic state, which organized a League of Nations against the revolution." The Bolsheviks favor an internationalism, but of a different kind, a dictatorship of the proletariat, and to get it they advocate the overthrow of all existing governments. The political hecklers in America who are assailing the League of Nations are playing into the hands of the Russian "Reds." They are giving aid and comfort, strength and support, to the internationalism of disorder. While it is true that America's sovereignty should be safeguarded by reasonable and proper reservations, it is nevertheless

true that these reservations should be considered and adopted without any thought of the effect upon the presidential election of 1920. The failure to establish a League of Nations would be a world tragedy and in its wake may come revolution. The ground gained by the war would be lost and the dead would have died in vain, for they fought to end autocracy and its champion, militarism. Until some plan is evolved which will provide machinery for the arbitration of differences between nations, all talk of peace is wasting words; the hope of ending war is idle dreaming.

THE "RED" FLAG IN EUROPE

Radicalism in Europe is rampant. The workers are active, the middle class sympathetic. Industrial centers are hotbeds. The conservatism of the farmers and peasants is breaking down. It is hard to define this radicalism—it is without form. It has no definite program, it isn't even political. The people are dissatisfied. The "Red" flag is popular. It promises a short cut. It answers the cry of the impatient. I was surprised to see many of the men who fought so gallantly under their country's flag and who but yesterday would have torn the "Red" flag from the flagpole, now defending it, carrying it and following it. The majority of them do not know what the "Red" flag stands for. To them it represents a protest against things as they are. The attitude of mind of the workers in Europe is eagerness for a change—some change—any change. Every one knows

the symptoms, understands what is wrong, but the remedy is only vaguely discussed.

I attach much significance to the new attitude of organized labor in Europe. Labor unions formerly concerned themselves with wages, terms of employment, shop conditions, safety appliances, recognition of their right of collective bargaining. Since the war the labor movement has taken up questions entirely outside of its field, questions properly the concern of all the people, questions of government policy. I have in mind recent demands made by the working men in England, France and Italy. These demands were addressed to the regularly and properly elected representatives of the people, the governments. They were accompanied by threats of general strikes if they were not acceded to. This step is an innovation; it is revolutionary.

The working men are citizens and have a voice in the government equal with all other citizens. After the people have selected their representatives, the men chosen should be responsible to all of the people without regard to class or station. A government by one portion of the people is autocratic. Government of the people, for the people, and by the people, means all of the people. The effort on the part of minority in the labor movement, who challengingly call themselves socialists, to dictate to the state, representing all of the people, is an attack upon democracy. If successful it would destroy the state and leave the great majority of the people, including the workers, less free than they are now. What

sane man, whether he is a working man or not, is in favor of minority government?

I witnessed many demonstrations in Europe under the "Red" flag, in which the leaders demanded from the government three things.

First, they demanded the release of all the men in jail who were held for political crimes. These included men found guilty of sedition and treason during the war. I cannot understand this demand. Why should men be released from custody who sought to stab in the back the men who went to the trenches to fight and die for freedom? I should much prefer to see all of the burglars released. If I am compelled to choose between the traitor and the burglar, I will have no trouble in making my decision.

Second, they demanded that no soldiers be sent to Russia. The agitation on this point was so strong that when the British government attempted to send soldiers to Russia last summer, the soldiers mutinied, and so far as I am able to learn the feeling was so acute, the situation so critical, the government dared not court-martial them.

Third, they demanded that all conscription laws be abolished.

It is apparent that these demands, coming from a minority, backed by a threat, constitute an invasion of the rights of the people. The question is not whether or not one believes these things should be done; the issue is the method resorted to. I do not believe soldiers should be sent to Russia; I never have. In my opinion allied

intermeddling has been harmful, but if these matters of general public policy are to be decided, all of the people should have a vote in the verdict.

This new attitude of labor, in conjunction with the growing popularity of "direct action," indicates that the labor movement is losing faith in law and political action. I am not saying that labor's experience with politics, the betrayal by men it has supported, and the default of political parties to carry out preëlection pledges, may not be responsible for a distrust in political government. I am not denying that capital has had the ear of government more than it should; that property has been given more thought than human beings. I am concerned with the danger these innovations promise, a danger to the working men themselves, a menace to law and order, without which no one is secure, without which there can be no freedom.

I heard a speech in London that impressed me deeply. It was applauded by several thousand men and women—average good British working people, most of whom wore service badges. The speaker, a clean young Englishman of about thirty-five, said:

Political action is a failure. We vote and we are betrayed. Political parties are the agents of bands of capital. Their purpose is to keep the workers apart, knowing that divided we are powerless. The only time they are willing we should unite is when war calls for men. What did we win in the war? Nothing. We thought we had a stake in the game, that the hand we were playing was our own. Now that it is over we have discovered that we won nothing.

What did the working man ever get by voting, except

the worst of it? The word vote comes from a Latin word, meaning "to wish." Who ever got anything by wishing?

We are like the story in Bellamy's "*Looking Backward*." You remember he spoke of a coach. On top of this coach the capitalists sit in the sunshine enjoying the ride. On the side of the coach, hanging by their fingernails and toenails, are the hundreds of thousands who make up the middle class. Millions of men are pulling the coach. They are sweating and trudging—they are the working men. Running along the side of the coach are millions more, fighting to get a chance to get hold of the rope and pull the coach. They are the idle. There is only one thing to do. That is to stop pulling the coach, let go of the rope. Don't wish about it; do it. The fellows on the top of the coach don't do any wishing—they boss and drive.

The crowd cheered. There was truth in the speech. The working man has not had a square deal, but this fact does not make the plan of direct action a sane, wise plan. Revolution would only lead to blood and disorder and leave the very men who revolted in a far worse plight. The millions who are the majority have an infinitely better weapon than force. They have the ballot. They are in the majority. Men must think their way out of the wilderness. They cannot fight their way out. When they try to they go deeper in.

I found the word Bolshevism in the minds and on the lips of the working people of Europe. I expected to find them anti-Bolshevik if for no other reason than that Bolshevism came from Russia and the Bolsheviks made peace with Germany while the Allies were in a death struggle with her. I found them confessing their faith

in Bolshevism, speaking of it as a new religion, resenting the obstacles their own governments had placed in its way.

Ireland was the last place in which I expected to hear the word Bolshevism. The Irish people are in many respects the most conservative in the world. History shows that their only radicalism has been uprisings seeking national freedom. The Irish are a people of reminiscence and tradition. Eighty per cent of the Irish are Roman Catholics, and no single power has so consistently and continuously fought socialism as the Catholic Church. I attended the Irish Trade and Labor Assembly held in August, 1919, at Drogheda. The delegates to this National Convention of Organized Labor in Ireland represented approximately three hundred thousand union men and women. The delegates came from Ulster and from the south and west of Ireland. In this Convention were Sinn Feiners, Nationalists and Unionists. A resolution sending greetings and sympathy to the Soviet government was passed by the delegates. Delegates who held opposite opinions on the Irish question stood together and voted for the Bolshevik resolution. Later I learned that few of them if any knew the facts about the Bolshevik program, its aims, aspirations and methods. I asked a leading spirit at the convention if he believed in communism, the abolition of private ownership of property, and he made quick answer: "Of course not. Such a theory is rank nonsense. It is socialism. It is impossible and impracticable."

I found this same paradox in England and on the

continent. Frequently workmen are Bolsheviks because the employers are opposed to it, and many employers are against Bolshevism because organized workingmen lean toward it.

The United States Senate Sub-Committee on the Judiciary, after a searching investigation of Bolshevism, reported that through utter ignorance of what Bolshevism means as a code of political and social morals in Russia, every dissatisfied element in the United States has seized upon it as something of a Utopian nature; this finding holds good as to Europe.

"It is interesting to note," the Senate Committee reports, "that every witness called before the Committee as a champion of the cause of the principles of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic admitted that he or she had never read the constitution of the (Bolshevist) government of which he was the champion." The same charge could be truthfully laid at the door of most of those who oppose the Soviet scheme.

CHAPTER VI

THE WORD BOLSHEVISM HAS SEIZED UPON THE IMAGINATION OF THE WORLD

I MET a young American major just back from the French front. Before the United States entered the war he was one of the many impatient at our delay. He believed it was our duty to join the fight when the ruthless submarine campaign torpedoed the *Lusitania*, sending to sea graves American women and children. I distinctly remember his face as he read the headlines in the papers telling of the murderous slaughter of our people on the high seas. After his first greeting he startled me with "The war is over. I'm a Bolshevik." I did not know what the word meant, yet it carried to my mind an impression, and, while the impression was hazy, it was clear at least in one particular. It sounded like the confession of a crime.

He had always been of a quiet, conservative type. Before the war one would have almost judged him a pacifist; he was even-tempered, mild of manner, and I think that before August, 1914, he was a pacifist in head and heart. It was only the call of a just cause, the fight for an ideal in which he believed, that had made him a soldier. In this respect he was typical of 90 per cent of his countrymen.

I had spoken to him the day he enlisted. He was one of those who volunteered, who might have waited for conscription and claimed a just exemption. He was in the beginning of his married life, with two very young children. By profession he was an engineer. Going to war meant leaving a wife and two babies, leaving a job that promised advancement. I recall his enthusiasm, the intensity of his patriotism, his quiet disregard of the danger to himself. I am sure that there was little hate in his make-up. He saw a danger to the world. The honor of his country had been offended. He was an American, one of those upon whom the duty fell, so he went.

He, a Bolshevik! Why? I was confounded, confused. The only meaning I gave to his remark was that he was an anarchist. The word "Bolshevik" sounded "Red" to me. It flared of the torch, photographed disorder, lawlessness—it registered blood, violence, assassination, force, hate, insanity. I wondered how this word had become the vehicle for so many sensations that disturbed peace of mind and sounded alarm.

From whence had the word come and what company had it kept that so fouled its soul? What did it really mean—had it a definite meaning? Was it a bug like the "flu" germ? Had it come among nations to destroy them and to the hearts of men to silence the message. "Peace on earth, good will to men." Would it run around the world as a scourge? Was it a postscript to the bloody war lesson, prophesying more anguish and tears than four

years' fighting had brought? Would the world, coming out of the war bent, now be broken?

Or was it meaningless myth? Was the word a bogie, a bad joke, a nightmare pressing heavily on a tired, nervous world's head?

Or was the meaning that men had read into the word a lie? Was Bolshevism the message of a new Messiah being cried down by the money-changers of our time in the same way their ancestors had silenced the word from the Mount and destroyed the Message Bearer with the lash and the cross?

In every mind was the thought and from every tongue fell the word. Russia had given the world a word. It had encircled the globe. Everywhere people were speaking the word—it found a place in every language. Its use had become universal. The old, the young, rich and poor, the learned, the uneducated, the serious, the simple, the toiler, the artist, the poet, and the peddler, the tinker and the thinker, held the thought and spoke the word. Men, women and children spoke the word, read the word, and felt the thought it carried.

To the nine hundred and ninety-nine it was a word of ill-omen, a word of terror and fear. To the one in a thousand it was a word of hope, a light for the feet of a stumbling world. The 999 said that some of these people called Bolsheviki were dreamers of a strange dream, that twisted idealism had made them mad, that the majority of those who profess faith in Bolshevism were sick with a strange, social fever, that they were

mischief-makers, ne'er-do-wells, criminals, that they sought to burn the world.

The dictionary definition threw no light on the meaning of the word. I decided that to learn what Bolshevism is I might with wisdom adopt the scientific method used by the doctor of medicine in arriving at a diagnosis. The doctor examines and gathers the symptoms, the meaning of the disease. He then determines what diseases might produce these symptoms. By a process of elimination he discards one possibility after another until at last there is but one disease left, one thing that the symptoms can mean.

Most of us have the habit of using terms loosely. Seldom do we give time or thought to the exact, real meaning of things. The meaning of Bolshevism is too important to the world not to try to understand it. There is a difference between having the acquaintance of a word and knowing it; the former is a mere introduction, the latter an intimacy.

The word Bolshevism has become an epithet, a popular invective, a slur, an insult, an outlet for contempt, contumely and hate. Its parentage influences our definition of it. Most of us see the Russians with the eyes of the caricaturists, who for so many years have portrayed the Russian as the moujik with high boots, disheveled hair, wild whiskers, the face of an assassin, the body of a terrorist in action, the suggestion of a long dagger smeared with hot blood, under his great coat.

Since the war, when the fastidious diner wearily orders his consomme and the waiter brings it a bit tardily or

cold, he thinks to himself or, if courageous enough to speak his mind, he calls the cook a Bolshevik. He has found a word to express his irritation. It serves his profane feelings and at the same time saves his smug respectability.

Once the maid asking for an afternoon off provoked a knowing smile. Her mistress granted the request, charged it up to a possible romance and generally suspected the policeman on the beat. Since the war it is different. The maid is looked upon with suspicion. Her motives are questioned. The request is considered a symptom of the new terrible disease, Bolshevism. The mistress thinks to herself: "The maid doesn't want to work any more; she is down with the epidemic."

The office boy, working the reliable excuse that his grandmother had died again, to get an afternoon off to go to the ball game, is trying to shirk work, in the opinion of his employer, who formerly, when such an application was made from the same source, chuckled as he granted it, while his memory took him back to his own boyhood days when he used the grandmother yarn to answer the call of the ball field.

Many captains of industry see the symptoms of the new dread in every movement and thought of the workers. The demand for living conditions and decent wages are grudgingly received by minds soured with the thought that it is Bolshevism.

The hirers of child labor, looking hatefully at legislation designed to end child slavery, call the leaders of child life conservation, Bolsheviks. When doctors

and public-spirited men and women insist that an irreparable injury is being done the nation in allowing women to work for a period in excess of the hours they are able to work without menacing their motherhood, the profiteers from woman labor cry out: "You are invading the right of private contract; you are mad with Bolshevism."

The wag with the wit of a barber defines Bolshevism as a wild idea surrounded by whiskers. The saloon-keeper, bowled over by prohibition, screams "Bolshevism." The anti-saloon leaders come back with the answer, "Your 'personal liberty' cry is only a camouflage for Bolshevism."

If any one disagrees with you, don't grant him the right to an opinion, don't reason with him—just call him a Bolshevik.

If a doctor, making an examination of all of the patients in a hospital, discovered they all had certain symptoms in common, such as temperature, weakness and pain, and because of these findings should diagnose the sickness of all of the patients as pneumonia, the doctor would be regarded a lunatic, yet there are men in the world to-day who are as foolish as such a doctor would be. They call every symptom of unrest, without regard to its history, Bolshevism.

BOLSHEVISM IS SOCIALISM PLUS FORCE

If I were asked to name the principal cause for the growing unrest my answer would be Bolshevism. The almost universal attitude of big business toward Rus-

sian Bolshevism—an attitude adopted by most of the governments of Europe—has been, and is, Kill it; don't waste time examining it; it isn't worth trying to understand; no good can come of it; it must be fought; it isn't entitled to a trial. Reams of paper have been used to assail it. Captains of industry and government officials have vied with each other in making assault on it. Many who oppose Bolshevism are indignant if you ask them what it is and why they oppose it. They characterize it, attack it, resent it, discuss it without throwing any light on the subject. Absurd lies have been told about Bolshevism. Later these unnecessary lies have been exploded, with the result that suspicion has been bred, unrest fed. The effect upon the workers has been to increase hate for their employers and destroy an already weakened faith in government.

Whether Bolshevism is right or wrong, whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, it is at least a definite political plan, worthy of being examined, measured, weighed and tested. It is entitled to a hearing on its merits. It cannot be howled down in abuse.

Leaders in the campaign against it frequently and confusingly define it as anarchy. If there is one thing that Bolshevism is not, it is anarchy. Much controversy will be avoided, many differences of opinion dissolved if we once come to a fair and open understanding of the Bolshevik program. We are too prone to form opinions without information, rush to judgments without understanding, and then stubbornly close

our minds. Much of the discord and strife of life in big things, as well as in little matters, is due to this habit. Anarchy is not criminal lawlessness. This is the popular misconception of the term. Say "anarchist" and the average man or woman thinks of a bomb-thrower, a dynamiter, a firebrand. Such a man is not an anarchist; he is a terrorist, a criminal, a destructionist, a murderer.

Anarchism is an old and respectable philosophy. The anarchist is an individualist. He is in favor of a free life for the individual. He is opposed to turning over the individual's power to the state. He argues that great power delegated to government limits the growth and freedom of the individual. He dreams of an ideal state in which human beings will be so perfect they need no law. His doctrine is an enlargement, and exaggeration of the idea that the government which governs least governs best. He isn't a lawbreaker. He is a law abolisher. He reasons that when murder leaves the human heart there will be no occasion for laws against killing; that the statute against murder is only printed words on the page of a law book, utterly and entirely without meaning, or existence to the man who is incapable of killing his fellow man. The anarchist says, that we should develop our artistic and moral sides and by evolution gradually repeal one law after another until all law disappears. It is pure idealism—it is a movement toward perfection. It is the millennium. It is poetry. Kipling wrote its constitution when he wrote:

And only the Master shall praise us,
And only the Master shall blame,
And no one shall work for money,
And no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of working,
Each in his separate star
Shall draw the Thing as he sees it
For the God of Things as They Are.

Few people will contend that this theory is anything more than a beautiful dream. Probably the first and greatest of the anarchists was the great Greek philosopher Zeno, from Crete, the founder of the stoic philosophy, who died 270 years B. C. It is disturbing to find dynamiters called anarchists, and in the same breath hear included some of the greatest idealists that have ever trod the earth. The very mention of the two types in the same class gives respectability to the totally ugly, depraved, ignorant, lawless criminal.

I went to a standard authority for a comon-sense definition of Bolshevism. I was in Prague on my way to the Bolshevik front. I spent an afternoon with President Thomas G. Masaryk of the new Czechoslovakian republic. He is a Slav. He knows Russia. He was in Russia during the revolution and at the beginning of the counter-revolution which put Bolshevism in the saddle. He has written of Russia and is a recognized authority on the subject. I asked him, "What is Bolshevism?" His answer was: "Bolshevism is consistent socialism."

Bolshevism is an old, untried theory of government.

Its object is to secure a greater production and a more just distribution. Socialism says that men are without motive for efficient work to-day because they do not get a fair share of the things they produce; that the way to stimulate production is to adopt common ownership. Under such a plan, it is claimed every man would be working for himself, in the sense that all would be working for the state, and that as all are an equal part of the state their interests would be common and mutual. The Socialist says if all the people of the world were at work they could produce an abundance of everything necessary for the world's happiness and comfort, every one would have all he needed, no one would have more than another and it would be to the interests of each individual to work to shorten his own workday.

The program of socialism promises the destruction of all private ownership. There will be no such thing as private property. No one will own land. The land, the factories, the railroads, the mines, everything, will be owned in common. The state will hold title to everything, manage everything and distribute the product. This plan abolishes profits, rent and private capitalism.

To understand this doctrine it is necessary to clearly know the meaning of the word "Capital." Many people confuse the word "capital" with the word "money." These words have totally different meanings. Money is the metal or paper used by a government to make easy the exchange of products. Without money the world

would go back to the barter system, in which the man who had corn traded it for meat, clothes, and the others things he needed. Capital is the unconsumed product of labor. In other words, all of the food, cloth, clothing, machinery, etc., in the world is its capital, just as a man's capital is the food he has in the cupboard, the clothes he hasn't worn out, the money in the bank which represents a power to buy. It is the surplus. It is the reserve.

Plato, the Greek philosopher, was one of the first socialists. In the republic of Plato there is a defense of state socialism. From Plato to Lenin men have been urging communism as a cure for the ills of the world, as a remedy for wrong, as a means of realizing exact justice.

Modern socialism dates from the "Communist Manifesto," published in 1848, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Their outline of the socialist plan seized upon the thought of the world. Since that day it has been gathering the dissatisfied of the world and grouping them in a class, developing what they term a "class consciousness." Back of it has been an insistent, uninterrupted propaganda which has reached all corners of the globe. Billions of leaflets, pamphlets, tracts and books have been circulated. Millions of speeches have been made. Drawing-rooms have been thrown open to it, highbrows have professed the faith, lowbrows have thundered the creed from soapboxes on the street corners. It has flourished best in Europe. It has furnished prime ministers. Its voice to-day in the parliaments of Europe

is not a whisper—it is a shout. In the new governments which have come out of the war it is a militant, dominant factor.

The Bolshevism of Russia is pure socialism—literal communism. At this juncture I am not writing of the methods of the Bolsheviks. First, I want to make clear and simple their plan. Bolshevism is an effort to put into practice the doctrine preached by Plato, programmed by Marx.

CHAPTER VII

THE TEST

ADVOCATES of the "Red flag" remedy have been demanding a trial, a test. The demand has been growing. Before they can be silenced they must be shown. Out of the test of socialism in Russia is bound to come good. Whether the theory is practical or not, putting it to the test will answer the question, satisfy the demand, and tend to quiet unrest.

The fair-minded investigator must acknowledge there was justification and reason in trying the remedy. That the world has been suffering from poverty cannot be denied. I have found few men even among the conservative, responsible leaders of business and governments in Europe unwilling to admit that conditions before the war were not right; that many changes were inevitable; that the dissatisfied elements in society were coming together and that unless men were given better lives, they were determined to fight. The working man was deteriorating physically under the strain of brutal working conditions which exacted too many units of physical energy for the number of calories of food he was getting. The hemoglobin count, the red corpuscles, were disappearing from the blood of the working people. It

was not a theory; one could see it in the faces and movements of the people. Medical men recognized the fact. A walk through the poorer district of any industrial city in Europe furnished plenty of evidence of this alarming condition. Men, women and children were resorting to false stimulants to keep up. Tea, coffee and alcohol were being used in increasing amounts.

Men were stretching their arms and yawning. Squalor and filth reeked in the homes. Many lived in abject poverty, many more lived on the border line of the garbage alley. Few were able to garner even the smallest surplus. It had become a hand-to-mouth existence, a fight to meet the grocery bills, buy stockings, shoes, and the scant amount of clothes to cover their bodies. It was bread and coffee for breakfast, bread and tea for dinner, tea and cheese for supper. Sausage sometimes took turns with cheese. Once a week, the Sunday repast, a stew—a few vegetables and a bone. In the Latin countries it was the same, except that diluted cheap wine substituted for tea. Men found themselves poorer and older at the end of the week than they were at its beginning. Over the workingman's head suspended night and day by a thin, weak thread, the dreaded sword of poverty. The thread might break at any minute. It was the thread by which they held the thing called a "job." What did they care about the rights of private property? They didn't have any private property. The Socialists had willing listeners when they ranted of communism. It promised to give these people property, to give them a common ownership of everything. It wasn't hard to

convince propertyless workingmen that this was better than ownership of nothing.

The Bolsheviks of Russia are entitled to the presumption of good faith in selecting the Marxian formula. It is only fair to them, and to the remedy, to examine the experiment with a mind free from prejudice. In admitting the good intentions of the Bolsheviks I am not conceding that Bolshevism is practicable, workable; that it has succeeded or can succeed. For the present I am trying to give fairly the whole story of the effort. It is as foolish to try to answer the Bolshevik propaganda by calling the Bolsheviks ugly names, as it would be stupid to accept Bolshevism because its advocates are sincere.

Russia is the patient. If we are to intelligently judge the treatment called Bolshevism, it is necessary to get a complete history of the patient and examine the conditions under which the experiment was tried. Any doctor who is a scientist would follow such a procedure in handling a medical case. If a doctor announced to the scientific world that he had a remedy for cancer, which at the present time is an incurable physical disease, just as poverty is a social one, the scientists would give a hearing to his theory, seek a fair test for it, keep their minds open, and judge the efficacy of the remedy by the results produced. Communism, as a treatment, a cure for poverty, has never been put to the test on a scale and in circumstances which justify any positive judgment as to whether or not the plan is practical. As I have already written, the Russian Bolsheviks insist that if every one owns everything in common there can be no poverty.

They base this statement on their faith that communism will increase production, claiming that competition shackles production. According to their analysis the competitive system takes from the individual the inducement to work—communism would give him an incentive to work; it would be a stimulant; under it, men would work better and produce more. Russian Bolsheviks further declare that the present system is bound to provoke an increasing number of strikes and that strikes stop production, cause waste, increase poverty. There is no doubt that there could be no poverty in the socialistic state if communism succeeded in stimulating men to work harder, thus greatly increasing production, because there would be more to eat, more to wear, more to use, and as the distribution would be controlled by the state, all of the people would receive an equal share of the great abundance, all would have enough. For the sake of fairness I am conceding that the distribution program would be honestly and justly carried out, but a better distribution, a more equal and just division would mean nothing unless the first, the fundamental promise of Bolshevism—greater production—is fulfilled. Any plan which decreases production causes a shortage of the things necessary to life. If the Bolsheviks are wrong in their belief that communism will increase production, then Bolshevism would make poverty general, universal, and instead of Bolshevism curing the cancer on the body of civilization, it would make the entire body of civilization a cancer. If the claims of Bolshevism are well founded, sound in common sense, capable of fulfillment,

communism would be the greatest blessing ever conferred upon humanity. On the other hand, if the Bolsheviks are wrong, and communism took from them the inducement to work, then notwithstanding all the good intentions of the Bolsheviks, their communism would be the greatest scourge the world has known. This is the simple issue. If Bolshevism is the good thing its advocates say it is, it will bring the millennium, and every human being should favor it. But if impractical and unworkable, then it is a danger, the "Red" flag is its proper signal, and the world should avoid the danger signal as an engineer charged with the safety of human life would avoid running by a red light on the track ahead.

Going back to the doctor who honestly and sincerely believes he has a cure for cancer, let us consider what a scientist's world would demand before offering a judgment as to the value of his proposed cure. First, they would free their minds of all prejudice. They would be reasonable and patient as they would be thorough in examining the proposed remedy from every possible angle. They would analyze the formula, examine it in the light of experience. Why should we not follow the same sensible plan in considering Bolshevism? We shall get farther if we do. Why should some of us accept it without knowing what it is? Why should others condemn it without understanding? And why should both these groups get excited and irritated, and add to the world's unrest?

I purpose to follow the method of the scientist, as

nearly as possible, in examining Russia, the Patient; the world cancer, Poverty; the remedy, Bolshevism.

First, a history of the patient.

Second, the formula—the remedy.

Third, the methods used in applying the remedy.

Fourth, the history sheets showing the effect of the treatment upon the patient.

Fifth, the condition of the patient after thirty months' treatment.

SOCIALISM FROM PLATO TO MARX

For nearly four hundred years Russia waited for morning. It was a terrible night. Brutal dreams tortured her. She writhed in despair. Time moved slowly. The clock ticked agonies. The air was thick with groans. Motherhood bore slaves. The cradle was a coffin. Feast days were celebrated by massacres. Czars from Ivan the Terrible, 1554, to Nicholas, the last of the Romanoffs, executed in 1918, used the bodies and souls of human beings as manure to fertilize the soil in which grew the rank weed of imperialism. History calls them emperors, truth labels them brutes, torturers, murderers.

It was a lightless day, a hopeless night, for the Russians, which began with the curses of Ivan and ended with the execution of Nicholas. During this night of three hundred and seventy-five years its people marched the treadmill. It was an endless tramp of feet. In the dark, great bodies swayed with weariness. Heavy shoulders bent forward. Strong legs marked time on

the treadmill steps. They kept time to the lash of the whip. It laid bare their backs, the backs of young and old, of women and children as well as men. Sweat formed into red froth as it mingled with their blood. They grew blind in the dungeon darkness. They stumbled and halted, only to be called back to the monotony and drudgery of the tramp by the lash and the bludgeon. Their legs rose and fell—they marched, but never forward. It was left, right, left, right; tramp, tramp, and always on the treadmill steps in the hopeless dark. They mumbled prayers, but God couldn't hear; the curses of their masters drowned out their petitions. It was so dark in the treadmill that even God could not see, and so God forgot Russia. Forgotten, abandoned, they bent their weary backs toward the sod, the grave offered rest—it was kind. The only thing they owned was their pains. They lived a communism of suffering, a socialism of slavery.

The revolution of 1917 battered down the door of the treadmill. Seized with wild joy, they madly rushed toward the light. In the open, they saw the sky and sun, they were bewildered. In the fury of delight they rushed on. It isn't strange, that eyes blinded by ages of darkness blinked in the light. It isn't surprising that they tried to reach the center of the sun. Suffering in the light is different from suffering in the blackness the Russians had known.

When their eyes became accustomed to the light they looked around to see where they were—to learn what had been happening in the world.

They had a task before them, the building of a free man's house, a house in the light, a house without a dark corner. They knew little about freedom, except that they wanted it with all their hearts. Their experience had been with slavery. They knew little about the practical work of building a house in which freedom might live pure and secure.

They saw civilization and they gasped when they saw that its body was covered with a malignant sore. It was an ugly, festering, running sore. They learned its name. It was written in the oldest of chronicles—it was the incurable, horrible leprosy of the world—POVERTY. They were told that it was the cause of the thing religion labels sin, that poverty had transformed Christ images, struck in clay, into hunch-backed souls, that the sickening matter running from sores caused the red blotches on the world's body known as red-light districts; that other effects were the swollen blackish blue boils, the tenements and slums. Even the darkness of the treadmill had not produced worse.

They learned about poverty. They read its autobiography. They read how it had robbed children of their childhood, erased faith from the minds of men, and mobilized women in a dreadful traffic. They learned that much of the thing called crime was poverty's work, that normality and morality are matters of education. That to be good requires knowledge of right and wrong. They read that statesmen called poverty THE PROBLEM. Reformers called it a curse and became unpopular because of their persistent attacks upon it. In the verdict

of a thoughtless world those who fought poverty were called long-haired men and short-haired women. People did not stop to remember that these long-haired men and short-haired women gave of their time and strength to the poor. These who were maligned for following in the footsteps of the first Lover of the Poor were those who cried out against the tenements, demanding for human beings the sunshine and air stockmen give their cattle. These unpopular ones were the same who brought ice to keep milk cool in the hot summer for the children of the slums; these were the crusaders against child labor, the protestants against working so many hours each day that exhaustion marred and marked the physical and mental strength of the children they bore.

So it was that these redeemed, freed people of Russia learned of the cancer and feared it as much as the thing they had escaped.

They beheld old-school politicians acting as doctors to sick civilization. These doctors, miscalled statesmen, were agreed as to the cause of the disease and that the symptoms threatened death. Many prescriptions had been given the patient, but none checked the disease. These prescriptions had been various formulas of government, the constitutional monarchy, a democracy, a republic. The giving of these various treatments failed to effect a cure. Civilization continued to suffer. At times pain became unendurable and the doctors gave local anesthetics. These were the laws, included under the general designation "Social Welfare Legislation." They made the patient temporarily more easy. They

allayed pain that might otherwise have produced convulsions—REVOLUTION.

And then these Russian people, studying what to them was a new world, discovered that many of these political doctors were quacks, unreliable and dishonest, and more interested in their own fortunes than the fate of the patient. Time and thought were taken up in holding their jobs, rather than in doing the work. That the schools of political medicine, called political parties, responsible for these doctors, were diploma mills, graft rings and that these physicians were suspected of being interested in keeping the patient sick and of not making an honest effort to cure. It was rumored also that there are people in the world who make profit out of poverty; that special privilege is the powerful profiteer of our day.

Away back in the fourth century before Christ, Plato had written about another remedy. Its object was to cure poverty. The Russians, seeing that the remedies in common use had failed, turned their thoughts to this old theory, this untried remedy. It was an experiment, to be sure, but, "nothing ventured, nothing gained." Disciples of Marx argued that it could not more completely fail than the remedies at present in use. There was an appeal in the plan, and those who advocated it possessed an enthusiasm that was contagious. The formula abounded in promises.

And with the revolution came into Russia one who had been exiled. For many years he had been a teacher and preacher of the untried remedy. Russians saw in him a savior. He came with a burning message. His

followers possessed the fervor of crusaders. He preached communism, saying that it alone could make freedom secure; that it would make them possessors of their country, owners of their homes. The words were welcome. The people listened and believed. They were as little children, so great was their faith. To them a promise was a truth fulfilled; the word, a living covenant. The promise was that the peasants would have their own lands and workingmen would be their own bosses. It was the word for which they had waited, the realization of the dreams they had dreamed. The prophet had come. The new day was before them. They rejoiced and cried, "Long live the Messiah!"

The man was Lenin, the message, communism.

CHAPTER VIII

RUSSIA'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—FROM RURIK TO NICHOLAS

PRIOR to the Eighteenth century what is now called European Russia was generally known as Muscovy, taking its name from its ancient capital, Moscow. It was not until the expansion of the empire in the Nineteenth century that the word Russia was used to designate the European and Asiatic dominions of the Czars. The word Russia probably comes from the Slavonic word "Rus" derived from Ruotsi, a Finnish name applied to the Swedes, meaning "rowers" or "seafarers."

The history of Russia begins with a legend. Nestor of Kiev, an old monkish chronicler, tells the story. In the nineteenth century Slavs and Finns lived in a tribal state in the forest region near Lake Ilmen, between Lake Ladoga and the upper waters of the Dnieper. Bands of military adventurers from the land of Rus, which is supposed to have been part of Sweden, invaded the country and exacted tribute from the people. In the year of 859 the tribes rebelled and drove out the Northmen. It was Russia's first revolution. The freed Russians set to fighting among themselves—civil war ravaged the land. Then as to-day order was apparently the first essential to peace

and prosperity. After three years of chaos, these, the first Russians confessed their inability to manage their own affairs and they sent a mission to Rus to invite their old masters to return and rule over them.

According to the legend, three brothers, Princes of Rus, Rurik, Sineus and Truvor accepted and founded a dynasty from which many of the princes of the present day claim descent.

Prince Rurik built his castle on the banks of the river Volkhov, which with Lake Ilmen formed part of the great waterway connecting the Baltic and Black Seas. It was over this route that the giant blond Norsemen who composed the famous Varangian bodyguard of the Byzantine emperors traveled from Scandinavia to Constantinople. Russia's first capital was Novgorod.

These new rulers from the land of Rus brought with them the spirit of adventure and the passion for conquest. Not content with ruling the tribes who had invited them, they set out to conquer the surrounding country. Before 200 years had passed they had successfully invaded Byzantine territory, established themselves as chiefs, threatened Constantinople with a fleet, secured as a consort a sister of the Byzantine emperor for one of their princes, Vladimir I, adopted Christianity for themselves and their subjects, held in check the nomadic hordes of the steppe and formed matrimonial alliances with the reigning families of Poland, Hungary, Norway and France. They became the greatest power in Eastern Europe.

They possessed an insatiable appetite for conquest,

but lacked the power to organize the territory they conquered. Their genius was entirely military. They had little administrative ability. The political future of the new state was destroyed when the princes of the Rurik dynasty divided the state into a number of independent principalities. For a time these separate states were weakly and loosely held together by the patriarchal authority of the senior member of the reigning family, the Grand Prince who ruled in Kiev. Family quarrels were frequent and finally all alliance between the independent states was destroyed. These princes were strong men. They wanted individual power. The authority of the Grand Prince in Kiev stood in the way of their ambitions. With the death of Yaroslav the Great in 1054 family feuds multiplied and the complete disintegration of the nation began. During the next 170 years, from 1054 to 1224, Russia was split into over sixty principalities. Disputes over the question of succession led to eighty-three civil wars.

During these interminable struggles between rival princes, Kiev, which had been so long the residence of the Grand Prince, was repeatedly taken by storm and ruthlessly pillaged. Finally the whole valley of the Dneiper fell a prey to the marching tribes of the steppe. Russian colonization and political influence retreated northward, and from that time the continuous stream of Russian history is found in the land where the Vikings first settled and in the adjacent basin of the upper Volga. Here new principalities were founded, some of them no longer acknowledging allegiance to Kiev. Thus appeared

the Grand Princes of Suzdal, of Tver, of Ryazan and of Moscow—all irreconcilable rivals. The more ambitious and powerful among them aspired, not to succeed but to subdue the others and seize their territory.

The greatest of these principalities was Novgorod. Since the days when Rurik first chose it as his headquarters the little capital on the Volkhov had grown into a great commercial city and brought under subjection a vast expanse of territory stretching from the Balkan to the Ural Mountains. Unlike the other Russian principalities it had a democratic rather than a monarchical form of government. The Republic of Novgorod was the first and only flicker of freedom in the long night of Russia, and it glowed but for a short moment.

Novgorod had a prince, but he was engaged by formal contract. He was merely the commander of the troops. All political power remained in the hands of the civil officials. The people had set up a popular assembly which met in the market place. It was called into session by the tolling of the great bell. The maxim of the state was: "If the prince is bad, into the mud with him."

Affairs in Moscow were different. There the supreme law was the whim of the autocrat. The people were slaves. They had no voice in the government. Democratic Novgorod and autocratic Moscow became bitter rivals. The future of Russia was in the balance. The issue was light or darkness, day or night, freedom or slavery for the future Russians. It is the crossroads in Russian history. Had Novgorod triumphed in the thir-

teenth century, the world might not have the problem of Bolshevism to-day. Russians would have escaped the political mines and dungeons of Siberia which for seven centuries have been their birth destiny. But in the turn of the balance Moscow and autocracy triumphed. The long Russian night came on.

The Tartar yoke came. The "Golden Horde" beat Russia down. The invading conquerors built their capital at Sari on the lower Volga. The Mongols mercilessly pillaged and robbed their Russian captives. Tax-gatherers armed with bludgeons, whips and swords scoured the country and kept the people's backs bent in unremitting toil. The Grand Khan, the chief of the Mongol Empire, lived with the "Great Horde" in the valley of the Amur in Siberia. From time to time he commanded the rulers of the Russian states to pay him homage and bring tribute to his court. To him the Russian princes were despised puppets. The journeys of these subject Russian princes to Siberia, blazed the trail and opened the cruel route which was later destined to play such an important part in the horrors of Russian history.

The first wayfarers on this road were Russian autocrats—princes, the degenerate and corrupt descendants of Rurik. The prince made his last will and testament and arranged his earthly affairs before he started on the cold black trail; then, as later, few who took the Siberia road ever returned.

The princes of Moscow sought favor at the Mongol Court by bribery and sycophancy. They more than car-

ried out the orders of the Grand Khan ; they outraged and robbed their own subjects to satisfy the Mongol Court. In return for the betrayal of their own people, these princes of Moscow were made the principal collectors and slave drivers by the Tartar Rulers. The princes of Moscow grew strong while the rest of Russia grew weak. This is the taint in the blood of the Czardom of Muscovy. Out of this line, came the Czars. These depraved Russian princes of Moscow abided their time. At the battle of Kulikovo in 1380, the Mongol yoke was broken.

Three Czars—Ivan 3rd, known as “The Great,” his son Basil and his grandson Ivan 4th, called “The Terrible,”—whose united reigns covered a period of 122 years, from 1462 to 1584, forged the shackles and fastened them on the people of Russia, shackles which clanked until the end of the last of the Romanoffs, Nicholas.

THE CRIME AGAINST THE PEASANTS

In talking with people about Russia, I have discovered that few in America have more than a faint, uncertain, vague idea of the country. Czar Nicholas, the last of the autocrats, was monarch of 8,660,000 square miles, one-sixth of the entire land surface of the earth. The great Russian empire is spread over part of two continents, Europe and Asia. It is almost entirely confined to the cold and temperate zones.

Three seas bound it on the north—White, Barents and Kara of the Arctic ; the seas of Bering, Okhotsh and Japan of the northern Pacific bound it on the east. The

Baltic sea, the gulfs of Bothnia and Finland limit it on the northwest; two sinuous lines of land front separate it respectively from Sweden and Norway on the northwest, and from Prussia, Austria and Roumania on the west. On the south and east the frontier has changed frequently, according to the expansion and contraction of the empire under the pressure of political exigency and expediency. The Black Sea is the principal demarcating feature on the south of European Russia. On the west side of that sea the south frontier touches the Danube for some 120 miles; on the east side of the same sea it zigzags from the Black Sea to the Caspian, utilizing the river Aras for part of the distance. As the Caspian is virtually a Russian sea, Persia may be said to form the next link in the southern boundary of the Russian empire, followed by Afghanistan. On the Pamirs, Russia has since 1885 been co-terminous with British India, but the boundary then swings away north round Chinese Turkestan, and the north side of Mongolia, and since 1905 it has skirted the north of Manchuria, being separated from it by the river Amur.

The total length of the frontier line of the Russian empire by land is 2,800 miles in Europe and nearly 10,000 miles in Asia, and by sea, over 11,000 miles in Europe and between 19,000 and 20,000 miles in Asia—a frontier of 68,000 miles.

The population of the Empire in 1915 was estimated at 182,182,600. This population was distributed as follows: In European Russia, 131,796,800; in Poland, 12,125,000; in Caucasus, 13,125,000; in Siberia, 12,337,-

900; in the Central Asian Provinces, 11,125,000; in Finland, 3,125,000.

Three different branches can be distinguished among the Russians, from the dawn of their history:—The Great Russians, the Little Russians and the White Russians. The primary distinctions between these branches of the Russian people have been increased during the last nine centuries, by their contact with different nationalities—the Great Russians absorbing a Finnish element; the Little Russians undergoing an admixture of Turkish blood and the White Russians submitting to Lithuanian influence.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Russians have absorbed and assimilated in the course of their history, numerous mixed tribes, mostly Mongolian and Turkic, the Slav type has been maintained with remarkable persistency. Slav skulls over ten centuries old, exhibit the same anthropological features as those which characterize the Slavs of the present date.

Class distinction in Russia has always been real. It bolted the door of opportunity against the great mass of the people. They were doomed to stay in their class; to remain a part of the struggling sweaty mass at the very bottom of life. 81.6 per cent of all the Russians were peasants; 6.1 per cent military and 1 per cent nobility.

Nearly 150,000,000 Russians are peasants. The land is their problem—it means home to them—work, life. They are born on it, they are buried in it. One hope alone has kept the Russian heart beating during the ages

of tyranny and suffering, and that, the hope that the day would come when he would own his own land. The Russian peasant has been a stranger in his own country. The man who tills the soil and lives on the land and yet never owns an acre of it, is a foreigner, even though his forebearers may have been natives of the country for centuries. The Russian peasants have felt this exclusion, for of all the people of the world, none are more home loving than the Russians. The land question is the hearth question in Russia; land ownership is the measure of freedom.

Some idea of the land crime in Russia is told in the startling figures showing the actual distribution of arable land, forests and meadows in European Russia.

The following table is only one count in the indictment:

	Acres	Percentage
State and Imperial family.....	400,816,000	35
Peasants.....	446,657,000	38½
Private owners, towns, etc.....	245,835,000	21
Unfit for cultivation.....	66,056,000	5½
	<hr/> 1,159,364,000	<hr/> 100

Prior to the Revolution according to official documents, the peasants were chained to hopeless poverty. Hunger was a fixed part of their lot. The official figures tell the story:

In the twelve central divisions of Russia, the peasant grows on the average, sufficient rye for bread for only two

hundred days in the year; often for only one hundred to one hundred eighty days.

Twenty-five per cent of the peasants received allotments of only 2.9 acres per male; half of the people received less than 8.5 acres. The tragedy of land distribution is understood at once, when we realize that forty-two acres are necessary to feed a family, but this inequitable land distribution served a purpose, it compelled the peasants to rent land from the landlord. The peasant's necessity was the landlord's opportunity, and he exacted the last drop of sweat. The rent made the tenant peasant, the landlord's helpless slave. His back was kept bent by redemption and tax burdens, which often reached from 185 per cent to 250 per cent of the value of the peasant's allotment. In addition, the taxes for recruiting, for the churches, roads and local administration were levied from the peasants, who, in consequence, got much deeper into debt every year. The Russian peasant found himself in a quicksand; the harder he worked, the deeper into debt he went. In the years prior to the Revolution, increasing arrears drove one-fifth of the peasants from their homes; every year, more than fifty per cent of the adult males (in some districts seventy-five per cent of the men and one-third of the women) were forced from their homes and compelled to wander through Russia in search of work.

*In 1861 a sham law was passed, which pretended to emancipate the serfs; even under the best landlords, the conditions of the peasants continued to be brutal. It is true, that household servants attached to the personal

service of masters, were released. Most of these joined the town proletariat. It was only as late as 1904, that the landlords were forbidden by law, to inflict corporal punishment on the peasants. Even this law was openly violated and the practice of treating human beings as brutes treat tired domestic animals, continued. The peasant was a chattel,—the cheapest farm fixture, there were plenty of peasants. Notwithstanding the hardships and the hunger in Russia, the population continued to increase.

The family tie has been strong in Russia and the families have been banded together into clans, so closely knit has been the tie to the tribe that Russians do not immigrate as individuals, they migrate in whole villages. The village community is the heart of Russia. The Rural Commune, called the Mir, consisted of all the peasant householders of the village. They met and elected a head man and collector of local taxes. The allotments of arable land given to the peasants, were not given to them as individuals, but the title was given over to the Mir, which was made responsible for the payment of the allotments. It was a sort of land communism. The Mir was a mortgaged community; the peasant's blood and soul, the security. The redemption charge was not calculated on the value of the land, but was considered as payment for the loss by the landlords of the compulsory labor of the serfs. The Mir was a clearing house for the peasant's troubles, a socialism of sorrows; a touch of self-government in sufferings; it provided a means of coöperation in burden bearing.

CHAPTER IX

RUSSIA OUT OF BALANCE

LESS than ten per cent of the people of Russia live "permanently" in cities or towns. I write the word "permanently" to call attention to the fact that large numbers of peasants and villagers come to the cities and towns to work for a part of the year in the industries. They retain their peasant status and their domiciles in the villages. In 1910 there were only forty cities in the Russian empire with a population of from 50,000 to 100,000, only four cities with a population of over 100,000.

Poverty forced upon the Russian people the coöperative spirit. In a great, long strain people can stand up together better than alone. It is the feeling of consolation in companionship. It is a principle of mass psychology that a group of men will dare to do a thing, to stand a suffering or a danger that no individual in the crowd would undertake alone. One of the oldest institutions of Russian life is the artel. The artel very much resembles the coöperative society of western Europe, with this difference, that the coöperative society in Europe as in America is the outgrowth of an economic trend. In Russia it was the unpremeditated result of necessity. It is the difference between one who is hungry

because he is dieting and one who is starving because he is without food.

The workers of Russia have suffered the same slavery the peasants have endured. The maximum wage has been a starvation wage. So when the working men from a province come to a city to work in the textile industries or as carpenters, masons, etc., they at once unite in groups of from ten to fifty persons, rent a house, keep a common table, elect an elder of the artel, to whom each one pays his share of the expense. All over Russia one finds the artel—in the cities, in the lumber camps, even in the prisons. When a building is to be put up an artel is organized. When a railroad is being built an artel is formed. In some instances the artel resembles a labor union, in that the arrangement of the terms of employment is made by a delegate or committee appointed by the artel.

Village life is primitive. The villagers live out of the world. The villages are very small, particularly in the extreme north. The houses are generally cheap wooden shanties. Owing to the great danger of fire, the villages generally cover a large area of ground. The houses are scattered and straggling. The conveniences found even in the American tenements are unknown. There is no chance for cleanliness. They live and sleep in crowded, smoky, unfinished houses. Furniture—they haven't even what the poorest farm tenant in America would call furnishings. A board for a table, a shakedown for a bed.

Russia's industrial life has always been out of balance with her agricultural life. Notwithstanding her riches

in raw material and her great possibilities for a successful industrial life, Russia has continued to be a nation with eighty-one per cent farmers, seven or eight per cent permanently engaged in industry, and three or four per cent of peasants who devoted part of the time to work in the industries. It has been said repeatedly that the imperial Russian government from the time of Peter the Great has been unceasing in its efforts for the creation and development of home manufactures. All of the evidence I have examined refutes this statement. There never has been any security to the worker in Russia. The only protection he has had, has been his interest in the family allotment. He could go back there and be hungry: in the city there was danger of actual starvation.

The Czars put every obstacle in the way of education and of course this prevented the growth of industry.

In 1902 the principal industries in Russia, representing all factories throughout the empire, of which the annual production was valued at more than \$1,000, were textiles, food products, animal products, wood, paper, chemical products, ceramics, mining, metal goods and miscellaneous. The combined number of those employed totaled only 2,259,773.

This dwarfed, stunted, paralyzed side of Russia—its industrial side—has a direct bearing upon conditions in Russia to-day and is an important part of the problem of the Bolshevik government.

A nation to be economically normal must have balanced agricultural, manufacturing and commercial sides. If these three departments of activity are not proportion-

ately developed the nation is economically a cripple. Russia has been and is in this sense an economic cripple. Her body is great and powerful; the physical constitution is strong. One arm, agriculture, is overdeveloped, and its overdevelopment has been at the sacrifice of the other arm. A great German economist, List, wrote:

A nation cannot promote and further its civilization, its prosperity and its social progress equally as well by exchanging agricultural products for manufactured goods as by establishing a manufacturing power of its own. A merely agricultural nation can never develop to any extent a home or a foreign commerce, with inland means of transport and foreign navigation, increase its population in due proportion to their well-being, or make notable progress in its moral, intellectual, social and political development; it will never acquire important political power or be placed in a position to influence the cultivation and progress of less advanced nations and to form colonies of its own. A mere agricultural state is infinitely less powerful than an agricultural-manufacturing state. The former is always economically and politically dependent on those foreign nations which take from it agriculture in exchange for manufactured goods. It cannot determine how much it will produce, it must wait and see how much others will buy from it. The agricultural-manufacturing states on the contrary produce for themselves large quantities of raw materials and provisions and supply merely the deficiency from importation. The purely agricultural nations are thus dependent for the power of effecting sales on the chances of a more or less bountiful harvest in the agricultural-manufacturing nations. They have, moreover, to compete in their sales with other purely agricultural nations, whereby the power of sale in itself is uncertain; they are exposed to the danger of ruin in their

trading with agricultural-manufacturing nations by war or new tariffs, whereby they suffer the double disadvantage of finding no buyers for their surplus agricultural products and of failing to obtain supplies of the manufactured goods they require. An agricultural nation is a man with one arm who makes use of an arm belonging to another person but cannot, of course, be sure of having it always available. An agricultural-manufacturing nation is a man who has two good arms of his own at his disposal.

POLAND CITED AS AN EXAMPLE

List further points out that the relative cultivation of the agricultural and manufacturing arms of a country possessed of an ample and fertile territory will give that country a population twice to three times as large as it could secure by the development of the agricultural arm alone, and maintain this vastly increased population in a much higher degree of comfort. Surplus agricultural produce is not necessarily capital in an agricultural country. Countries which produce such a surplus and remain dependent upon manufacturing countries are often obliged to purchase these manufactured goods at an enhanced price. He points to Poland as an example. She exported the fruits of her soil to obtain the goods which she could have manufactured from it. As a consequence she fell like a house of cards when organized nations attacked her. List considers that had Poland developed her manufacturing arm, besides retaining her national independence she would have exceeded any other European country in prosperity. To use List's words:

Go to fallen Poland and ask its hapless people now whether it is advisable for a nation to buy the fabrics of a foreign country so long as its native manufacturers are not sufficiently strengthened to be able to compete in price and quality with the foreigners.

Bolshevism set out to socialize political, agricultural and industrial Russia, and as I expect to examine the effects of communism in each of these departments of Russian life I have set down some historical and economical truths which must be kept in mind when examining the Lenin panacea.

RUSSIA'S GRAVE MORAL ERROR

An examination of Russia, the patient, just before the treatment was started, reveals several findings which are necessary to complete the history and physical examination.

Russia was seventy-eight per cent illiterate. This means that nearly four-fifths of the people in Russia could not read or write. It does not mean that they could not think. There is as great a difference between illiteracy and intelligence as there is between illiteracy and ignorance. I have met many Russian peasants who could neither read nor write but who had good native minds, genuine power of reasoning—home-spun thinkers. The Russian head had not been trained, but it was not empty.

The autocratic government was the principal conspirator against education. The autocrats knew that ignorance is the greatest insurance against uprisings, the best sedative to keep the slave asleep. The Church in Rus-

sia, the Orthodox Church, was used to keep the light from the people. The Czar was the "Little Father," the divine agent of God on earth, and the "Unholy Synod" of the Russian Church bowed, not before the Christ, but bent low before the Czar. They betrayed Christ, even as they betrayed the sons and daughters of men, the Russian peasants and toilers.

The people of Russia held firmly to their faith in God. The rest and ease their faith gave them was the only comfort they had. In moments of intense religious communion they were lifted out of themselves and for seconds forgot their burdens. These seconds were long spaces of relief, green spots in the endless desert waste of life.

How Christ must have wept when he witnessed the "Holy Synod," the monkish rascals, with their sacrilegious icons, silencing the protests of souls, throttling the cry for freedom, by quoting in his name that those who suffered most here would be highest in heaven. A blasphemy, a corruption of the Lowly One, who used the word brotherhood to define equality, and the fatherhood of God to express the justice that man owed to man.

It was agreed by and between the "Unholy Synod" and the czars that the Russian worshipers of God must not know how to read or write His name. So it was that the orthodox church of Russia used religion to insult God and hold his creatures in bondage. It was the one church in the world that did not provide prayer books for its members. It was argued that if the people had

prayer books they would learn to read, and if they read the Christ message on the Sabbath they might read more strange and dangerous books on the other days of the week. They might misuse their ability to read, and read messages like the American Declaration of Independence. The Orthodox churches painted the story of religion on its walls. They gave the people an education by the picture book method used for children before they have reached the kindergarten age.

The birth certificate of Bolshevism was issued on November 10, 1917.

The All-Russian Congress of the Councils of Working-men's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies decrees the form of the administration of the country, PENDING THE MEETING OF THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY. The provisional workers and peasants' government is to be called the Council of People's Commissioners. The administration of the individual branches of state life is to be entrusted to boards, the composition of which is to secure the carrying out of the program proclaimed by the congress in close contact with the organizations of workers, sailors, soldiers, peasants and employees. The government authority belongs to the board and chairmen of these commissioners, that is, to the people's commissioners, and the right of systematizing them belongs to the All-Russian Congress of the Councils of Workmen's and Peasants' and Soldiers' Delegates and its Central Executive Committee.

The government of the Czar was autocratic, not because it misgoverned the people, it was autocratic because the people did not have a voice in it. A government with good laws and honest administration which

denies the people a voice in their own affairs is as autocratic as a government with vicious laws that denies the people the right to govern themselves. When the people exercise the right to govern themselves the question of good government is with them. If they have less than good government it is their own fault. The kind of government a free people have is of their own making.

With the fall of the Kerensky régime the Bolshevik Party called a constitutional assembly and promised the Russian people liberty and the franchise. When this assembly met, the majority of the people's representatives were opposed to Bolshevism and the convention was marked for dissolution by its own begetters. Consequently a self-repudiating resolution was introduced, and when the assembly very naturally declined to pass it, the Bolshevik members withdrew and the assembly itself was forcibly dispersed by the "Red" Guards.

It was the moral obligation of the Bolshevik Party to abide by the decision of the majority in the convention made up of delegates elected by the people. By striking down the People's Constitutional Assembly, the minority backed by force stripped the people of Russia of their right to formulate the government under which they were to live. This action on the part of the Bolshevik leaders is on a plane with the conduct of a small band of armed hoodlums entering a conference made up of unarmed people and failing to have their way, pulling their revolvers and breaking up the meeting.

In the constitution and decrees of the Soviet government the Bolsheviks have tried to explain this breach of

promise. All they have said in the defense of this betrayal of the plain rights of the people by a criminal misuse of power is that it was expedient to dissolve the Constitutional Convention because the continuance of the convention jeopardized the future of the Soviet. What right had Lenin and Trotzky to think and act for the people of Russia any more than the Czars had? In speeches and writings Lenin and Trotzky have in a veiled way suggested that the peasants elected some members of the middle class, the bourgeoisie, to represent them in the convention instead of electing peasants. Why the question of class distinction, particularly from the men who once so earnestly condemned class distinctions? The peasants were free agents and had the right to select whom they pleased to represent them in their Constitutional Convention. Their choice was their business, Russia is their country.

When Lenin and Trotzky complained about the Allies not leaving Russia to the Russians, do they not know that they have taken Russia from the Russians?

No man can become free unless he is given a chance to exercise independence. It is impossible to get muscle by letting another fellow use the dumb bells. The Russians,—peasants and workers,—are human beings with an equal interest and an equal right in determining the form of government which they are called upon to obey, support and defend. Years have come and gone since Lincoln's day, and yet the thought of the world has not contributed anything to his basic definition of a free

country—"a government of the people, for the people and by the people."

Lenin issued his famous order. "Peasants, seize the land." This command was obeyed with great enthusiasm. They forgot all about freedom and the constitutional convention. They understood what land meant, they had been taught its meaning by being denied its possession. They knew little about political phrases and framework. The order to seize the land tore from the serfs their heaviest chains. Lenin became their liberator —his was the voice that said "seize the land." It is probable the peasants would ultimately have done so without Lenin's instruction anyway. Disorder and unrest had destroyed all respect for property rights. Property rights had a different meaning in Russia than elsewhere; property rights had meant the right to beat human beings, to buy and sell serfs. Yet the fact that Lenin had uttered the words made them reverence and respect him, even as a man will be thankful to one who has told him to be careful of a hole in the sidewalk, notwithstanding the fact he has already seen it. Bolshevism started with great popularity. This was the secret of it.

Of course the order to seize the land, all land, was based on the idea that the owners of land held title by and through their own wrongful conduct. God had made the ground and sunshine, and those who had taken title to it had only moved on and forced others off. This is the way the Bolsheviks reasoned, and from this point of view they were consistent. From the accepted viewpoint it was confiscation. It was dishonest. Many peo-

ple believe that acquiring property is frequently the result of industry and thrift; in some cases the title to property is based upon cunning, scheming and force. There are some who are without any private property because they prefer to squander their time, dissipate their energy and live shiftless lives. After all, it is a matter of opinion, and from the point of view of the Bolsheviks the order "Peasants, seize the land" may have been justified.

But when the order was given, the peasants seized it not for the community but to own it privately. On this point there can be no difference of opinion among honest, impartial, fair-minded men, and when the peasants seized the land to hold, use and own it as their private property they were guilty of taking title by the identical means used by others against whom they had complained and whom they had denounced as thieves.

The Russian people have the power to think and they soon realized that they had acquired property by the very methods they had always condemned in others. Their natural selfishness may constrain them to keep this property. The sufferings they have undergone may mitigate the offense, but one effect was inevitable, and that effect the most serious that could happen to a people on the threshold of a free future. I refer to the weakening of their moral nature, the making of a precedent justifying dishonesty. The ill effects of this act on Russia is observable in every subsequent symptom of the patient.

THE VISION

Karl Marx went to his grave with faith that communism would come, but never for one moment did he think that backward Russia would be the scene of the first great experiment. It was almost the last place in the world the socialist would pick out as a place in which to try out the theory. Marx, no doubt, visioned his fatherland, Germany, as the country destined to be first to adopt the creation of his brain, the Communist Manifesto, as the constitution of the Utopian state.

Nor did Marx and his disciples think that socialism would come in the circumstances of the world in 1917. Marx thought he saw causes at work which would force socialism upon the world, but they were quite different causes and conditions from the ones which accompanied the hoisting of the "Red" flag over the Winter Palace in Petrograd.

The prophets of the new dream had all said there would come a time when working men would become silent partners in production. They spoke of the age of the machine, the day when capitalism would reach the zenith of production. They told how it would come about, and they prophesied what would happen.

They spoke and wrote of the genius of the inventor, how man's mind would create labor-saving machinery. That great machines would till and plow the ground and do more in a day than a hundred men could do in a week; that manufacturing would become a matter of pushing buttons; that mechanical power would do the

work; hands of steel would take the place of human hands; steam would take the place of muscle; that the world was going on to the day of intensified production; that the time was not far distant when the work of the world would be done by a small number of men and a large number of efficient machines; that this would put man more and more at the mercy of the few who owned the machines; that the capitalist class would grow rich and powerful because of the great surplus of everything on hand, the great overproduction; that capitalists would combine and confederate for their mutual protection and for the general exploitation of the workers. That these great powerful combinations would be greater and more powerful than the government itself; that they would make the law, defy the world, would be above the law. Political organizations would no longer be groups of men divided on lines of principle; they would be but organizations in the hands of the capitalists used to keep divided the great mass of struggling, protesting people at the bottom of the world; they would feed political parties on corruption, keep them fighting each other and thus keep the people's house divided against itself.

In this day they said it would not be necessary for capitalists to own men as slaves; that slavery would be universal, the machine the shackle. That the strike would be no longer a usable weapon; that the surplus on hand would be so large that the powerful few could say to the weak many "strike and starve."

That the biggest and greatest machine of all would be the perfectly, running, completely dominating machine

of capitalism itself; that it would be an efficient, highly organized, finely functioning machine; that the workers of the world, growing more intelligent because of the spread of popular education, would see more clearly their rights and the danger to them of the power of the machine.

But the prophets erred. It came suddenly, unexpectedly. It came to the darkest part of the globe, where men and women were least fitted to try the experiment. This white light of idealism came to a people whose eyes were not accustomed to the soft yellow light of democratic freedom.

Three years of world war preceded its coming. The world's surplus was almost consumed. Exhaustion was showing itself everywhere. In Russia it was felt most.

The Russian people were demoralized. They were stampeded by the war. Twelve million of them had been mobilized, taken from the fields, sent to the front, untrained for the most part, unequipped, called upon to face the finest military machine the world has ever known, to stop Von Hindenburg's drives. The Russian men were put in the front trenches to fight; many of them without rifles were sent to death without a sporting chance to battle for life. The shells for the artillery didn't fit the guns, the powder wouldn't explode. To them it was not war—it was sacrifice, betrayal. In peace handicapped through poverty; in war they were handcuffed to death.

A single story that has gone through Russia indicates their plight. A staff colonel in the Russian army was mar-

ried to a German wife. When the war broke out she was in Germany. Under the military code, because of his position, he was permitted to send her a telegram each day. One day the staff at great headquarters changed the plan of attack that had been adopted late the night before. The colonel had sent his daily message to his wife before the change in plan was made on this day. He sought to send another telegram. He asked a runner to take it. He gave too large a tip. Two telegrams in a day and an extravagant tip created suspicion. The runner took the telegram to headquarters. It was opened, deciphered and found to be a complete statement of the changed battle plan. Of course the colonel was shot, but every one in Russia will tell you that the treason of this one man sacrificed two hundred thousand lives.

Russia's dead in the war totaled over two million. Over five million were wounded. These were workers and peasants. The story of their betrayal is the most immoral tale of the war.

Russia was a sick, tired, hungry, black Russia in March, 1917. The people were exhausted and demoralized. The undemobilized troops, broken in spirit, were trudging homeward. They looted and pillaged their own. Every one was robbing Russia. The spirit of law and order had left Russia's consciousness. Frenzy, panic, had seized Russia's brooding mind.

One day in March, 1917, grumbling, hungry people formed a procession and marched through the streets. They carried a slogan, "We want bread." Their bodies

and faces shouted the slogan. A regiment of Cossacks was sent to ride them down. It was the Czar's answer to the petition. It was not a new answer. Most petitions of the people had been answered in just this way. The Cossacks rode out, but they did not ride down the people; they did not shoot; they joined the parade. Another regiment was sent with the same result, and another. The thing had happened without as much blood as is often spilled in a street fight. A Czar, representative of a long line of unquestioned, unchallenged autocrats, was driven from the most powerful throne in the world. The smoothness and speed of the revolution startled the world, not less the Russians themselves.

A people's provisional government was set up. Kerensky became its leader. A sick man, with inordinate vanity, possessing great power of speech, but no force of action, he lasted until November 7, 1917, when the military revolutionary committee seized the government, and the next day handed it over to the All-Russian Congress of the Councils of Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

Russia, the patient, was now ready for the test, the trial of the new prescription which it was promised would cure poverty—Communism.

CHAPTER X

THE BEGINNING OF THE DICTATORSHIP—THE BIRTH OF BOLSHEVISM

THE seed of socialism took growth in Russia in 1898. It had been planted many years before. The planting was done in secrecy, the soil waited for and welcomed the seed, intellectuals guarded it, the people prayed that it might grow, for with its growth they believed would come a plant—"Revolution"; and the plant would bear a bloom—FREEDOM. The planters and gardeners of the seed were called "social democrats." Back of them were the people. The imperial government of the Czars had organized a powerful race of ferrets known as the secret police. They burrowed the ground in search of the seed. Human bloodhounds were turned loose on the trail of the planters of the seed.

In 1898, at Minsk, the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party was organized. A central committee was appointed and plans were carefully prepared for the overthrow of Czar Nicholas. The plotters talked little of socialism as an economic program. Less was said of the destruction of the right of private property. The idea of communism was in their minds, but it was latent, unprogrammed. The controlling thought of the party, its first purpose, was the overthrow of the hated govern-

ment. Differences of opinion as to the program that should follow a successful uprising were forgotten. Freedom from the terrible yoke was the one thought in the minds of the leaders and of the people. All were agreed on the main object of the party, the deliverance of the Russian people.

The bloodhounds found the trail. The daring men who made up the executive committee were run down and arrested. Their arrest gave life to the movement, growth to the party, it intensified the determination of the people. Propaganda and organization went on. The ferrets had not destroyed the seed.

A second congress of the party was held at Brussels and London in July and August, 1903. It was at this convention the seed had sprouted, revolution taken root. At the congress of Brussels and London, questions of organization and methods arose. In the effort to prepare and perfect a program the congress divided. The difference of opinion was fundamental, distinct and positive. The congress developed two leaders, both strong men. Lenin demanded a centralized body, a small, strong executive committee with full power to act, complete obedience to the committee, an iron attitude toward dissent and dissenters. He argued for solidarity, and to get it he said it was necessary to blot out independent opinions, surrender personal ideas, grant the executive committee power without limit. He favored a democratic state, he said, but he urged the use of autocratic methods to get it. All agreed that force was necessary to bring about the downfall of the Czar, but Lenin and his followers insisted

that after this was accomplished the force and violence should continue until every vestige of capitalism was destroyed and he would brook no difference of opinion. He stood out against all compromise. His program was blood and force, not only for the revolution, but in the building of the new state that was to follow. His vanity of opinion strangled his democratic pretensions. His arrogance was supreme, his methods were inconsistent with the spirit of the party, but Lenin did not care. He believed in driving—leading was too slow. If he was an idealist, he was also an autocrat.

Martoff led the opposition to Lenin, insisting that democratic methods should prevail in the party which promised a democratic program. He fought for freedom within the party. He objected to stripping individual members of the party and subordinate branches of the organization of their right to a voice and a vote in the program. He was for peaceful political action after the revolution succeeded. He stood for communism, but urged that it must be a process of growth. Lenin insisted that such a policy would deliver the party to the bourgeoisie. Next to the Czar and the secret police, Lenin hated the bourgeoisie. They have been and are his obsession. He gave to the word a broad meaning; he included in the bourgeoisie the man who was the owner of the small store, the little shop or the modest home. Every holder of private property, small or large, in the eyes of Lenin was an enemy of the new state, of the new freedom. The "petty" bourgeoisie were as dangerous as the nobles; neither must be given time nor quarter; both

must be destroyed and at once. To quote the substance of Lenin's words, a democratic government in Russia, established by the proletariat with the aid of the bourgeoisie, would give the capitalists a stronger control than they had enjoyed under the Czar. On this rock he made his stand.

The fight was to a finish. The clash divided the congress. The convention supported Lenin with his gospel of ruthless force. His war cry of pitiless persecution of the bourgeoisie carried the day. The majority of the convention followed him. The Russian word for majority is "bolshinstvo." Lenin and his following became known in Russia as the "Bolsheviki." While the word "Bolshevik" means majority, it does not follow that the party bearing that name in Russia represents the majority of the people. The name was given to the party because it represented a majority of the convention, a convention that in nowise represented the majority thought of the Russian people, except the one thought of deposing the Czar and destroying his régime. The followers of Martoff, who made up the fighting minority in the convention of 1903, were called "Mensheviks." The Russian word for minority is "menshinstvo." The fact that the opposition party to the Lenin methods is called Menshevik, or the minority party, does not mean that this party represents the views and political plans of a minority of the Russian people.

In 1905 the Russian revolution broke and for about eighty days the workers of Moscow and Petrograd ruled in a reign of terror. The lash and sword of the Cos-

sacks finally beat them down. Lenin fled to Finland and then to Switzerland. Although the revolution of 1905 failed, it left material of great value for a future revolution. Prior to 1905 the labor unions were in an embryonic state and existed clandestinely. The revolution strengthened these organizations and gave them consciousness. These labor union units became the nucleus of the organizations out of which came the Soviets. When the revolution of March, 1917, succeeded, these unions were the only available organizations in Russia. The provisional government of Kerensky was in the beginning almost entirely composed of the organized workmen in the factories. These men were Social Democrats. Their labor organizations were used to stabilize the revolution, to support it, to hold it together, and to prevent the fall of the revolution through counter revolutions. Until May, 1917, there was no such thing as a Soviet of the peasants. In that month, at Petrograd, a parliament of peasants was called. This convention brought about the merger of the peasants and soldiers and sailors and workers into the Soviets of soldiers', workers' and peasants' deputies.

At this time no one in Russia dreamed of the Soviet as an organ of government. The Soviets were councils representing the three classes in the revolution, the soldiers and sailors, the workers, and the peasants, and these councils acted as agents of their classes, watching the provisional government and trying to secure recognition and protection for their respective class interests.

In 1917 the Mensheviks, the party believing in political

action rather than direct action, was the majority party of Russia. The Mensheviki believed in communism as the Bolsheviks did. The difference was that the Bolsheviks insisted upon enforced communism, by bayonets, and at once, while the Mensheviki believed in thinking their way to the communistic state. Bolsheviks stood for the method of blood, the Mensheviki for the rule of reason.

Lenin and Trotzky set to work to give the Soviets what they called a political consciousness. What they really did was to poison the minds of the workers of Russia with the thought that they could take advantage of the revolution and build a government with this small minority of the population as dictators. They called it the dictatorship of the proletariat. It appealed to the radical, aggressive workmen; it promised them great advantage. They were shortsighted; they seized upon the thought and rallied around the phrase, "All power to the Soviets." Of course, the Soviets at this time did not represent one per cent of the people of Russia, and few stopped to think that a government imposing the will of one per cent of the people upon the other ninety-nine per cent of the people could not endure. "A house divided against itself must fall"; a country one per cent free and ninety-nine per cent slave cannot exist to-day.

The Kerensky government promised the people of Russia a constitutional convention, a constituent assembly. Lenin and Trotzky, then not in power, advocated a constituent assembly representative of all the people to frame the government of the new Russia. This promise was

the meeting place of all minds in Russia. Every one favored a convention of delegates elected by the people and authorized by the people to form a government for the people. The constitutional assembly was to meet in January, 1918. In the meantime the one thought in Russia was to sustain the revolution, to prevent a return to power of the Czar and the nobles. Lenin and Trotzky succeeded in seizing the revolutionary power, but they, too, were bound by their solemn promise to the people to hold the revolutionary power as a sacred trust and turn it over to the convention of the people. Before the constitutional assembly met Lenin and Trotzky came to power.

When the constitutional convention met, the Bolsheviks were a minority in the convention. The people had selected representatives, and the majority of these representatives were against Bolshevism, against communism by blood and force, but Lenin and Trotzky had the revolutionary power; they had the bayonets, the army and navy, the force of the revolution, which they held in trust for the people of Russia. Instead of turning this trust of power over to the elected representatives of the people, they used it to dissolve the constituent assembly. This was the first crime against popular rule in Russia. It was the beginning of a new dictatorship, a dictatorship called that of the proletariat, but in fact a dictatorship of Lenin and Trotzky supported by bayonets and cannon.

BOLSHEVISM IS THE LINCOLN FORMULA REVERSED

On the tenth day of July, 1918, the Bolshevik government adopted a constitution. They named the new nation the "Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic." They hung out a flag, a red cloth, in the left corner of which (on top, near the pole) are in golden letters "R. S. F. S. R." The coat of arms of the new Russian government consists of a scarlet background on which a golden scythe and a hammer are placed (crosswise, handles downward) in sun rays and surrounded by a wreath, inscribed: "Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic. Workers of the World, Unite."

The constitution of a country is its foundation. It must be solid if liberty is to be secure. The whole superstructure depends upon the foundation. Government is a house made of laws. There can be no peace, freedom and order without law. The people who live in the house, the great national family, have a vital interest in the house in which they live. It is their shelter, their security. It is the right of every free man to have a say in the kind of house he is to live in, a voice in the making of the laws he is called upon to obey and maintain. The house of Freedom is one citizen's house as much as it is another's. Without equality there cannot be freedom. Every Russian had an equal right to determine the kind of government that should prevail in his land. The Bolshevik government began by denying the people the right to a voice in the form of government of their country. A minority, without consulting the people, with-

out giving them a chance to express their views, forced upon the people a constitution. The Bolshevik government therefore was built on the false foundation of minority rule. The principle that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed was sent to the scrap heap.

The Russian constitution provides for a government of Soviets. The word soviet means council. The Soviet is a body of political officeholders who run the government. In our country, instead of calling these bodies Soviets, we call them township commissioners, village trustees, city councils or boards of aldermen, state legislatures, congress. Under the Bolshevik Constitution all power is given to the Soviets. This is and has been the rallying cry of the members of the Soviets. The Soviets have the power to make laws as well as the power to enforce obedience to the laws. The legislative and executive power is combined in the Soviet.

The Bolshevik Constitution divides Russia into regions, provinces, counties, towns, villages, rural districts and local rural districts. For the purpose of comparison we can liken Russia to the United States, a province in Russia to a state in our Union, and so on down through the list. We have no political division corresponding to the Russian region, a unit larger than an American state.

The Russian citizen's liberty is measured by the voice he is given in selecting the men who are to make the laws he must obey. The constitution fixes his freedom. It says how far he may go and no farther.

We have heard much about the "poor peasants." The

constitution makes them paupers in liberty. Down at the bottom of government the farmer, the "poor peasant," is given the right to vote for delegates to the local rural Soviet. This little body has about the same power in shaping the policy of Russia and making the laws that affect life, liberty and property as the township commissioners have in the United States. Governed by office-holders the Russian citizen's vote is confined to purely local matters. When the "poor peasant" has cast this one lonesome and meaningless vote for a representative in the local rural Soviet he is through.

The "poor peasant," having cast his vote for the local rural Soviet, leaves the task of government to the office-holders. The deputies elected to the local rural Soviet meet and elect the deputies to the next higher governing unit, the rural Soviet. Here is found the first governing body for which the "poor peasant" is denied a vote, but not the last.

The next unit of government in Russia is the county. The people do not have a vote for the delegates to the county Soviets. These county commissioners are elected by the members of the city and village Soviets and the members of the rural Soviets. This is government one step removed from the people of the cities and two steps removed from the "poor peasants."

The provincial Soviets are elected by the city Soviets and the rural Soviets. Again the people are without a direct voice in their own government.

The constitution says: "The All-Russian Congress is the supreme power." This body in the government

of Russia takes the place of our congress, our president and the cabinet. It has the supreme legislative and executive power. Do the people have a vote for these all-powerful congressmen? Certainly not. The All-Russian congressmen are elected by the city Soviets and by the Soviets of the provinces, who were elected by the city and rural Soviets, the rural Soviets having been elected by the local rural Soviets, whose members were elected by the people.

The All-Russian Congress is a very large body. The first Congress met in 1917. It numbered 1,200 delegates. The seventh Congress met in December, 1919, and the membership has grown to over two thousand. It is a big, cumbersome body, unfit for deliberative purposes, a sort of mass meeting, a platform for the relief of those who have speeches burdening their chests. The Congress never sits for more than a week. It was never intended to be an organ of government. The constitution tells the story.

Section 28 reads: "The All-Russian Congress shall elect a central executive committee of not more than 200 members." This takes the government another step from the people.

Section 30 says: "When the All-Russian Congress is not in session, the central executive committee is the supreme power of the republic." But we have not reached the end of the journey from the people to the seat of power.

Section 35 reads: "The central executive committee shall select a council of people's commissars who shall

manage the affairs of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic."

Section 37 reads: "The council of people's commissars is intrusted with the general management of the affairs of the republic."

Section 38: "For the accomplishment of this task the people's commissars shall issue decrees, resolutions, orders, and in general take all steps necessary for the proper and rapid conduct of government affairs."

Section 40: "The central executive committee has the right to revoke or suspend all orders and resolutions of the council of people's commissars."

But a "note" to section 40 of the constitution reads: "Measures requiring immediate action may be enacted directly by the council of people's commissars."

The council of people's commissars numbers 17. The people had no voice in selecting the people's commissars; they were not given a choice in picking the central executive committee; they were not allowed to vote for the All-Russian congressmen; in the rural districts the "poor peasants" were not even allowed to vote for the men who selected the men who in turn selected the congressmen.

At the head of the "Sacred Seventeen" is the chief of state, Lenin. At his right hand sits Trotzky, commissar of force in charge of the army and navy. When I think of the part the people play in this newest form of "free" government, and the distance they are kept from their country's affairs, I cannot help but see them through this constitution as though I were looking at them

through the wrong end of a pair of opera glasses. In truth it is a long way from the people to the throne of Lenin. The people make only the first and shortest step. There are five long and important steps between the "poor peasants" and the power, and three between the city voters and the real government of Russia.

The Bolshevik government is a government of office-holders, for officeholders and by officeholders. It is Lincoln's formula reversed. I have heard it said that democratic government is a failure because political officeholders do not truly represent the people. There is some justification for the statement, but the people have a remedy; the system is not at fault. I cannot understand the logic for the faith that a government which provides three or five additional sets of officeholders between the people and the government will make things better.

The title, People's Commissar, is full of meaning. It is obese with power. The title is copyrighted in the constitution.

In December, 1918, Lenin addressed a letter to the American workingmen in which he said:

Let incurable pedants, crammed full of bourgeois, democratic and parliamentary prejudices, shake their heads gravely over our Soviet; let them deplore the fact that we have no direct elections.

I suggest that Lenin put the Soviet plan before organized labor in the United States, ask the union card carriers of America to give up direct elections in their labor

unions, accept a scheme of government for their unions modeled after the Bolshevik plan, and see how many followers he will get. The rank and file of the labor movement guard jealously and zealously their right to a voice and vote for measures and men.

CHAPTER XI

THE SOVIET MACHINE

LENIN has frequently observed that representative government is a failure. He has insisted that the democratic form of government is debauched and destroyed by the political machine; that political corruption vetoes the will of the people. If Lenin is right in this conclusion, then the Bolshevik government in Russia offers from three to five times as much chance for political corruption as our own form of government. If it is dangerous for the American people to entrust their business to an agent whom they directly elect and who is directly responsible to them, how much more dangerous must it be to turn over the public business to seventeen men appointed by a central executive committee, the members of which have been appointed by an All-Russian Congress, this All-Russian Congress being elected by Soviets for whom the people did not vote? Were we to apply this plan to our own government, our Congress would be elected by the state legislatures and the aldermen of the cities. A congress so elected would pick an executive committee of 200, and this committee would elect seventeen commissioners

to whom would be given the supreme power of the state, both legislative and executive.

In the history of the ages two theories of government have been at war. One is that the majority shall rule—the other, that the minority shall rule. The people struggling for freedom have battled for the former; the few seeking special privileges have fought for the latter. The first is democratic, the second autocratic. No compromise is possible; there is no middle ground. These two antagonistic ideas have nothing in common; like parallel lines, they can never meet; in their nature they are separate and apart. The government of the late Kaiser of Germany and the government of Nicholas of Russia, were founded on the idea that the minority shall rule. History shows that minority rule has always enslaved the majority. The rule of the minority over a majority means slavery for the many. It is human nature. The principle always works the same result. If it is a political meeting and the minority runs it, the result is a machine and a boss. If it is a nation, there is a bureaucracy and a dictator who derives his power not from the consent of the governed, but from the bayonets of the army. There may be room for honest differences of opinion between honest men on many questions, but there is not any room for difference of opinion among honest freemen on the proposition that minority rule is a menace.

In Article III of the Bolshevik Constitution we find incontrovertible evidence that the government of Soviet

Russia is built on the tyrant's stone, minority rule. Section 25 reads:

"The All-Russian Congress is composed of representatives of city Soviets in the ratio of one delegate for every 25,000 voters, and of representatives of the Soviets of the provinces in the ratio of one delegate for every 125,000 inhabitants."

No explanation is given for basing the representation in congress from the cities on the number of voters, while the representation in congress from the provinces is based on the number of inhabitants. The words are not synonyms. A voter is an inhabitant of certain age and possessing certain qualifications. An inhabitant is any one who lives in the province, regardless of age or qualifications. If the word inhabitant is given the same meaning as the word voter, then it is apparent that the constitution discriminates unjustly against the "poor peasant." As they have had no general elections in Russia, it is impossible to give the official construction of these two words. If the word inhabitant means any man, woman or child living in the province, the discrimination against the "poor peasants" is just as obvious, although it does not go to the same length. As an illustration, if we read this important provision of the constitution giving to the word inhabitant the same meaning as we give to the word voter, then we see that the voters of the city have one congressman for every 25,000, while the "poor peasants" have one congressman for every 125,000. If we construe the word voter to mean

the qualified legal voter, and the word inhabitant to mean any human being living in the provinces, we learn that the people of the city have one congressman for every 25,000 voters, while the people of the provinces have one congressman for every 62,500 voters. I base my calculations on the fact that in the United States we estimate that there is one voter to every five of the population. This calculation is based upon male suffrage alone, with the voting age fixed at twenty-one years. In Russia both men and women have the suffrage, and the vote qualifying age is eighteen years. I, therefore, figure that there would be one voter for every two in population. There is no question about the discrimination against the "poor peasant" and the favoring of the city voter. It is only a question of how much.

Lenin may be the idealist some people say he is, but this section of the constitution proves him to be a practical machine politician in his methods. The provision was written to meet a situation. It has a purpose. Lenin has frequently written and spoken about the "poor peasants." He can be forgiven for overworking the phrase. The "poor peasants" constitute the bulk of the population of Russia. It is not bad politics, although it smacks of demagogic, to speak often and sympathetically of the "suffering poor," particularly when the "poor peasants" form the majority of one's constituency. Many successful politicians owe their offices to this appeal. Measured by his words, Lenin is the friend of the "poor peasants;" by the constitution he is their enemy.

As we have seen, the constitution specifically declares

that the supreme power of the government is vested in the All-Russian Congress. This is true only in theory, for we have read how the All-Russian Congress turns the supreme power over to a central executive committee, which in turn surrenders the power to the seventeen People's Commissars.

The discrimination against the "poor peasant" runs all through the constitution; the Bolsheviks are at least consistent. Paragraph "B" of section 53 of the constitution furnishes additional evidence of the conspiracy against the peasants. It reads:

The provincial Soviets are composed of representatives of the city Soviets and the rural Soviets, one representative for 10,000 inhabitants of the rural districts, and one representative for 2,000 voters in the city.

In the regional congresses it is the same, one representative for 25,000 inhabitants of the country, and one representative for 5,000 voters of the city.

The governments of the nation, of the regions, of the provinces, are based on the disfranchisement of the "poor peasants." It is to wonder if there is any significance in the fact that the people of the city have one representative for a certain number of votes, while the people of the country have one representative for just five times the number. The ratio is always the same: For All-Russian congressmen it is 25,000 in the city, as against 125,000 in the country; in the regional congress it is 5,000 voters of the city as against 25,000 inhabitants of the country; in the provincial congresses it is one rep-

representative for 2,000 voters in the city, one representative for 10,000 inhabitants from the rural districts. Why this five to one? I am wondering how Lenin hit upon the ratio of five to one; is there any connection between this five-to-one discrimination against the "poor peasants" and the ratio of population in Russia between city dwellers and "poor peasants," which is about five to one? It is not difficult to guess the reason for this action. Any American ward politician could furnish the explanation in a minute. All political experience proves that a political machine is best controlled, easiest organized in the cities. Political machines have never been popular in the country districts. The Soviet form of government is a political machine. The control of the machine is insured by disfranchising the "poor peasants." The men who designed the Bolshevik Constitution knew one thing about practical politics, and they knew this one thing thoroughly, and it is that cities are accessible to political control, amenable to political influence, ideal for the political machine.

The soldiers are generally stationed in cities. This gives them the power of city voters. They are not discriminated against, they are favored. Soldiers are not free agents in the same sense as civilians. Civilians have a freedom of thought and action that the army does not enjoy. The soldier is an employee of the government; he is under discipline; the People's Commissars fix his pay, determine the quantity and quality of his food, arrange for the comforts of the barracks; the votes and the bayonets of the military sustain and support Lenin.

BOLSHEVISM STRIPS RUSSIANS OF CITIZENSHIP

The first great hypocrisy of the Bolshevik government was its pretense at establishing equality. Caste and class reminded the Russians of suffering, so the Soviet government, through the People's Commissars, issued the following decree:

All designations, such as merchant, nobleman, burgher, peasant; titles, such as prince, count, etc., and distinctions of civil ranks, privy, state and other councilors, are abolished and one designation is established for *all the population of Russia—Citizen of the Russian Republic.*

Article 4 of the constitution discloses the insincerity of the decree. It does more. It gives evidence of the great felony committed against the freedom of the Russian people by Lenin, who decreed that: (1) All Russians who are eighteen years of age and who have acquired the means of living, through labor that is productive and useful to society, and also persons engaged in housekeeping for the former; (2) soldiers of the army and navy; and (3) members of the former two classes, when incapacitated, shall have the right to hold office and to vote.

But the constitution goes further; it tells who shall not hold office and shall not vote:

First. Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain profit.

Second. Persons who have an income, such as interest in capital, rents, receipts from property, etc.

Third. Private merchants, trade and commercial brokers.

Fourth. Monks and clergy of all denominations.

Fifth. Employees and agents of the former police, the gendarmerie, and the Czar's secret service; also members of the former reigning dynasty.

Sixth. The demented or mentally deficient.

Seventh. Persons who have been deprived by a Soviet of their rights of citizenship, because of *selfishness, or dishonorable offenses*, for the period fixed by the sentence. .

Section 7 affords great opportunity for construction; the Soviets are given power to disfranchise citizens, because of "*selfishness or dishonorable offenses*." Who shall say what constitute these offenses? The courts? No. The people? No. The dictator? Yes. When we remember that the first thing the Bolsheviks did when they came into power was to drive from the Soviets every one disagreeing with the Bolshevik plan of communism, at once and by force, it is easy to understand the terrible power given in this phrase and the tyrannical use that could be made of it. Every difference of opinion with their methods or plans would be a selfish and dishonorable offense in the eyes of the Bolshevik rulers, and the foolhardy dissenter could be stripped of his citizenship, and, no doubt, would be. This section writes the death warrant of freedom of opinion; it gives to the Soviets a bludgeon with which to beat men and women out of citizenship. It makes the citizen the servant, the officeholder the master; it is government upside down.

In a note to section 64 of article 4 of the Constitution, we learn the local Soviets may, with the consent of the People's Commissars, "lower the age qualifications for voters."

What a splendid opportunity this joker in the constitution offers for political jockeying. If the central power discovers it is about to lose control of a village or rural Soviet, it has the power to nip the uprising in the bud. The People's Commissars can arrange with the minority in the local Soviet to reduce the age limit and give the vote to young boys and girls. When it is remembered that the constitution directs the People's Commis-
sar of education to introduce in all Russian schools the study, explanation and justification of the Bolshevik constitution, it is not hard to understand why young people in whose minds has been drilled a reverence for Bolshevism should vote for and support the Bolshevik program.

Three groups of people classified by their occupations are permitted citizenship. They are the members of the army and navy, the working men and women, and the peasants who do not hire labor. Every one else is made an outcast. The man who has saved a little money, earned in the sweat of his brow, and invested it, is not permitted to become a citizen; the man who has a little shop—it may represent the sacrifices and savings of his whole life—comes under the ban, he is unfit for free citizenship in Bolshevik Russia; the farmer who hires help, even though it is a single farm-hand in harvest time, is a "criminal exploiter," and he is denied the right

to vote or hold office. It is dangerous to give the thrifty, the industrious, the vote.

Lenin's antipathy to democracy is clearly stated in his denunciation of the Mensheviks, which is the rival faction of the Socialist Party in Russia:

In its class composition, this party is not Socialist at all. It doesn't represent the laboring masses; it represents FAIRLY PROSPEROUS PEASANTS AND WORKING MEN, PETTY TRADERS AND MANY SMALL AND SOME EVEN FAIRLY LARGE CAPITALISTS, AND A NUMBER OF REAL BUT GULLIBLE PROLETARIANS WHO HAVE BEEN CAUGHT IN THE BOURGEOISIE NET.

A "fairly prosperous" working man may be a proletarian, but because he does not accept the will of Lenin he is denied citizenship and looked upon with scorn by the Bolsheviks.

The man who devotes his life to religion, who comforts the poor, visits the sick, is the servant of God, is driven from the Political House; he is denied the right to vote.

Lincoln—sad, patient, kindly Lincoln, who lived for man, once said:

It (the Bible) is the best gift which God has given to man. All the good from the Savior of the World is communicated to us through this Book. But for that Book, we could not know right from wrong. All those things desirable to man are contained in it.

Theodore Roosevelt said:

You may look through the Bible from cover to cover and nowhere will you find a line that can be construed into an

apology for the man of brains who sins against the Light. On the contrary, in the Bible, taking that as a guide, you will find that because much has been given to you, much will be expected from you; and the heavier condemnation is to be visited upon the able man who goes wrong than upon his weaker brother who cannot do the harm that the other does, because it is not in him to do it.

Bolshevism is purely materialistic. It has either a great fear or a great hatred of God. From the beginning it has shown a positive antagonism toward the Bible. It excluded from all oaths the mention of the Supreme Being. The Bolshevik attitude on religion is epitomized in the following anecdote:

It was the custom under the old régime that on Easter Sunday every newspaper in the empire carried the headline "Christ is Risen." On Easter, 1918, all Bolshevik papers substituted for this sacred sentiment, "100 years ago Karl Marx was born."

The fact that men and women were born in Russia, that their parents and grandparents were natives of the soil for centuries, means nothing to the Soviet Government. These disfranchised ones speak the Russian language; it is their only tongue. Their blood has had a part in Russian suffering, yet the Bolshevik Constitution exiles them; they are natives without a country; and why? Because by honesty and industry they have saved a little or because they are giving their lives to the service of man in the name of the Lowly One.

Die Freiheit, the Berlin Organ of the Independent

Social Democrats, a revolutionary newspaper, which has been most friendly to Bolsheviks, says:

Purity of principles is for Russia only an article for exportation. Always seeking to introduce anarchy and disorder in the world. Lenin to-day finds his road to Damascus, for he is making a fresh appeal to capitalists forms in order to reëstablish the general economy of the country. The dictatorship of the proletariat is reducing itself to the dictatorship of a few communist leaders. The Councils' system is broken up, for the workers have no longer any influence in the factories. The Agrarian program of the communist is a complete Fiasco.

The constitutional provision defining citizenship puts a premium on indolence, a penalty on industry; it encourages waste; it punishes economy; it makes the successful an outcast; it makes of the ne'er-do-well a citizen; frugality, thrift and industry are crimes; those who possess these qualities are branded as undesirables; they are denied citizenship.

Lenin tried to justify all of this by saying that in the transition from capitalism to socialism it is necessary to rule with an iron hand. Capitalism must be destroyed. The system must be uprooted. Even so, what right has Lenin, without the consent of the majority, to take citizenship from native Russians? What is his excuse? Where is the force of his argument? Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that communism, Bolshevism, is a panacea for all the ills of the human race, what right has Lenin and his minority to force it on the people of Russia? Conceding his creed is for the common good,

is it not his first duty to make the people see and understand its virtues, and then, by and with the majority consent, put the creed to the test? To assert that his program is economic does not change the fact that his methods are undemocratic. The Lenin system of disfranchising the people must eventually demoralize them.

How can a people be free without learning self-reliance, without trying self-government? Proclaiming people free does not make them free. Freedom is action. It is the ability to govern one's self. It comes from experience and exercise in governing one's self. The definition of freedom is self-determination, and the word "self" is an important part of the definition. Admitting for the moment that Lenin is trying to govern the people for their benefit, although not permitting them a thinking part in the government, does it not follow that his methods incapacitate the people for self-government? How can a child learn to walk except by trying, and even though the child stumbles and falls, is bruised and hurt, these experiences are part of the education in walking.

The right to vote is the test of freedom. Rob a free man of his voting right and you make of him something less than a free man. It does not matter whether you treat him well or not, if you rule him without giving him a say in his own government, you destroy his independence. Suppose the constitution of a debating society, a lodge, a farmer's grange, a labor union, declared that some members could hold office and vote, while others were not eligible for office and could not vote.

What would be the position in the body of those who were denied all right of participation in its affairs? They would be compelled to obey the rules, do the bidding and bow to the wish of those who had the right to vote. What would be the effect upon the voteless ones? They would be demoralized; they would become nonentities. Those possessing the voting power would grow arrogant, arbitrary and autocratic. The war of the ages, the struggle of all history has been the fight of men for equality in government. The right to vote is the supreme test.

Experience has formulated certain tests by which it is safe to fix the credibility of witnesses and determine the value and weight that should be given to their testimony. It is of first importance that the witness has had opportunity to know the facts about which he testifies.

Oscar Tokoi, prime minister of Finland, spent several months in Russia. He had plenty of opportunity to observe the operation of the Bolshevik Government and conditions in Russia. He entered Russia as a Bolshevik sympathizer. Here are his words:

In comparison with the entire population only a small minority supports the government, and what is worse, to the support of the government are rallying all the hooligans, robbers and others to whom this period of confusion promises a good chance of individual action.

Even a great part of those who from the beginning have stood with the government and who still are sincere socialist democrats, having seen all this chaos, begin to step aside or to ally themselves with those openly opposing the government. Naturally as time goes by there remains only the

worst and most demoralized element. Terror, arbitrary rule and open brigandage become more and more usual, and the government is not able to prevent it.

Karl Radek, a leading Bolshevik, is authority for the statement that the peasants do not want Soviet rule. In an interview in Berlin given to a correspondent of the New York *Globe*, he said:

The claim made by some of our people that the majority of the Russian people favor a Soviet Government is not true. The peasants are against the Soviet Government.

Lenin's special defense has been that the "class-conscious" proletariat, those to whom he gives credit for bringing about the revolution, favor the Bolshevik government. The government is defined to be a "dictatorship of the proletariat." If the proletariat are not in favor of the government, then it is obviously a dictatorship of Lenin and Trotzky alone maintained by the "Red" Guard. Samuel Gompers, patriot and grand old man of organized labor in the United States, quotes the following from the *Bolshevist Communar* of May 17, 1919:

"The Sytin Printing Works employs 1600 persons. In the communist nucleus there are ten communists and sixty sympathizers. After the meeting at which an anti-Kolchak resolution was defeated, a "vindication committee" was elected to explain in the press the true attitude of the shop: "The workers of the shop are against Kolchak, but they would not adopt the resolution, because it came from the Bolsheviks."

"Postavschik"—employs 2,660 workmen. The nucleus has

thirty-six communists and ten sympathizers. Of these there are only eight persons in the place and no party work is therefore conducted. The shop committee consists of communists. Literature is well distributed, 700 copies of newspapers and from 15 to 200 copies of magazines.

Here we see that even the immense Soviet subsidies for propaganda are futile in spite of the fact that the workers are advanced socialists, shut off from the outside world and without an independent press. It will be noted that in the most of these factories the economic dependence of the workers on the Soviets for jobs, bread tickets and factory subsidies, to say nothing of terrorism, has led to Bolshevik committees of shop officials.

"Bromley"—1200 workers employed. The group consists of ten communists and fifteen sympathizers. The group meets every week. The factory committee is communist, the general state of mind is improving.

"Einem"—employs 1400 workers, 850 of whom are women. The nucleus is forty communists and eight sympathizers. Their influence in the factory is little. The presiding officers of the shop are communists. Lectures are arranged occasionally. Newspapers are well distributed.

"Centrosoyuz"—900 workingmen are employed. The nucleus twenty-five communists and four sympathizers. The women are very backward and party work among them is very difficult.

"The Electric Station of 1886"—1300 workmen are employed. The communistic group has twenty-seven members. Party work is not being conducted. The general state of mind is calm. The shop committee is communist.

This publication (the *Bolshevist Communar*) lists 1600 workers in one part of Moscow and finds among these 687 Bolshevik party members and sympathizers. The one union mentioned in the district shows about one-half of its membership in these two classes.

CHAPTER XII

THE SOVIET DEFINITION OF LIBERTY

ACCORDING to the Bolshevik rulers of Russia all the world is old-fashioned—behind the times. We still cling to the belief that the people should be the sovereigns, that public officials are public servants, that the safest plan of government is that form of government which is nearest to the people. In the United States each citizen has a vote for the men who make the local laws, the city or village ordinances; a vote for the man who enforces the ordinances, the mayor; a vote for the representatives in the state legislature, where the laws are made; for the governor, who enforces the state laws; a vote for the congressmen and senators who enact the national laws and formulate the national policies, and a vote for the president, who carries out the supreme law of the land. While it is true that in the case of the president, we vote for electors who elect the president, the electors vote instructed by the people. We come together in political parties, present platforms, and every citizen has a chance to register his opinion of men and measures. The citizen has a right to vote at primary elections for party candidates and for the delegates to the conventions which formulate the party platforms.

The Bolsheviks point out that political parties do not live up to their platforms; that candidates for office default in their promises after elected; that representative democracy is frequently not representative of the people. We have the power to express our wants, to record our will and we also have the power to punish our betrayal. We can recall from office recreant public servants; we can add to our legislation by assuming the power to initiate laws, and by compelling the reference of legislation back to the people before it can become operative as law. Our public officials are merely our agents; we hire them, we pay them; we can discharge them and punish them if they fail to obey our instructions. Such is our power. If we do not use the power intelligently and effectively it is our fault. If we are indifferent to the rights we possess and fail to use them, the fault is with us. Therefore, we do not condemn a system of representative government because some of the individuals in that government are unfit and unworthy of the rights they enjoy.

The Bolsheviks favor a change in the method of governing the people. The plan adopted is based on the theory that the people cannot be trusted, but that the officeholders are above suspicion. Bolshevism is government from the top down, rather than from the bottom up. They work on the idea that power delegated through many hands will lose its corruption just as running water does.

There is a numeral which we know as the "jester" of numbers. It is the number "23." It is known in Amer-

ican slang as "skiddoo." The Bolsheviks inserted in the constitution a joker, and oddly enough they gave it the "skiddoo" number, "23." It is found in Article 2 of the constitution:

Being guided by the interest of the working class as a whole, the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic deprives all individuals and groups of all rights which could be utilized by them to the detriment of the socialist revolution.

Here is the big beware sign in the constitution. What does it mean; what fears must come into the minds of men and women in Russia when they read this paragraph? The constitution deprives every one, individually and collectively, of exercising any rights he or they may have which are opposed to Bolshevism. Did tyranny ever impose a more arbitrary, autocratic ukase? The paragraph first concedes that individuals and groups have rights, and then commands the people not to dare use those rights. Freedom of opinion is crushed, even thought is silenced. Who is to determine what rights, if exercised, might be detrimental to a socialist revolution? The meaning is as plain as the command is stern. Fall in line with Bolshevism or perish, is the order.

I wonder what the militant soap-boxers, who shout about freedom of speech, would think and say if in these days of unrest the Congress of the United States and the President should make such a pronouncement. America, radical and conservative, would rise in protest against any such law. We live, grow and progress as a people because of our freedom of thought, speech and

action. We silence the man who criminally advocates lawlessness, and we do it for the same reason that we arrest the man who spits on the sidewalk. It is to conserve the public welfare, the common good of the great majority who do not believe in violence and disorder. What would happen to our "Red" agitators if they were in Russia to-day and ventured a single disagreement with the Bolshevik program, either in policy or methods? This constitutional provision is not a muffler on free speech, it is a gag.

What freedom can there be in a country in which opinion is shackled? How can a nation make progress except by the conflict and friction of opinion? In the United States, experience has taught us that the majority is generally right, that the many can be trusted. We have put into practice the idea that many heads are better than one. The Bolshevik powers insist the fewer heads the better. This is the method they adopted to socialize freedom of thought, freedom of speech. It means a communism of ideas, but a very limited communism. Limited in fact to the "Holy Seventeen," and the oracle-dictator. The people are outside the pale of this communism. In their zone communism commands obedience and silence. The human race has fought many a fine fight to take the fetters from the minds of men, and no fight was ever made for a more essential liberty. When the mind of man is not free, what freedom can there be? The jailing of the body, serious as it is, is only a small interference with man's liberty compared with the imprisonment of his mind.

The Bolshevik clamp muzzles the press, and this is one of the most serious phases in the present situation. Notwithstanding all the criticism which may be justly made against the press, the fact remains that the newspapers of the world have been a great force for good, a great power in securing freedom. We see the world through the eyes of the newspaper; it is our source of information; we depend upon it for the facts upon which we base our opinions. Notwithstanding the bitter partisan character of much of the press, few papers know party lines or party prejudice when public interest is menaced. The press has thrown a terrific searchlight on ratholes and driven out the rats. The freedom of the press is indispensable to free government.

Lenin, before he came into power, was the loudest voice in Russia, crying for free speech. His pen had been most bitter against interference with the freedom of the press. In his pamphlet, "Lessons of Revolution," he wrote:

The printing establishments of the labor press are raided. The Bolsheviks are arrested, not infrequently without accusation, or on the pretext of charges which are simply calumnious.

It may be argued that the prosecution of the Bolsheviks is by no means a violation of free speech, since only certain persons on specific charges are thus prosecuted. But such arguments bear the earmarks of premeditated untruth. For why should printing offices be raided, newspapers suppressed, for the crimes of individuals, even if these crimes are proven and sustained by law? It would be altogether different if the government declared criminal the entire

Bolshevist party, its ideas and views. But every one knows "that the government of free Russia never could, and indeed never attempted to do anything of the kind."

There is not a word in the Soviet Constitution about the right of a trial by jury. There is no such thing intended. Under the American Constitution, and in that of every civilized country, the citizen has the right to submit his case to a jury of his Peers when accused of any crime or misdemeanor. He has the right to appeal to a court, that is independent of the Executive Power and the Legislative Power, for the protection of any and every right, the deprivation of which is threatened. This right is the safeguard of the liberty of the poorest and most friendless individual. He has the right to the assistance of counsel, and to force the attendance of witnesses in his defense. If he is detained without a charge being made against him, held without warrant in law, he can appeal to the courts and compel the highest officers of the law to show cause why he is being deprived of his liberty.

Not so under the Socialist Constitution of Russia. All power—executive, legislative and judicial—is placed in the same hands. There is no appeal from the decisions of this autocratic court, and the writ of habeas corpus does not exist.

Lenin coming into power wrote into the constitution new crimes, and he left out of the law the right of a fair trial for those accused. He declared all opposition to the Bolshevik program a crime. Thereupon, he struck down freedom of thought, freedom of speech,

freedom of opinion, freedom of the press, and freedom of Justice.

BOLSHEVISM IS A RULE OF FORCE

The effort to socialize politics did not democratize politics; it was not intended to. In practical operation, it fulfilled its purpose, it created a political autocracy.

The greatest power in Russia to-day is the "Red" army. Without an army a minority government cannot exist. Force is the strength and security of minority rule. Bayonets held the Czar on his throne, the same weapons hold the Lenin-Trotzky government in authority. Every inducement has been offered men to join the army. This is practically the only real job in Russia to-day. The soldier is at least guaranteed good food and a warm bunk. He escapes the danger of cold and starvation. Living conditions are better in the "Red" army than in any other occupation.

Section 19 of Article 3 of the constitution is interesting:

For the purpose of defending the victory of the great peasants' and workers' revolution, the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic recognizes the duty of all citizens of the republic to come to the defense of their socialist fatherland, and it, therefore, introduces universal military training. The honor of defending the revolution with arms is accorded only to the workers, and the non-working elements are charged with the performance of other military duties.

No one except the "Reds" in Russia is allowed to possess or carry arms. This rule is strictly enforced, and searches for arms have been made almost weekly. As

a consequence, the one armed force in Russia to-day is the "Red" army, and this is the backbone of the Bolshevik government. The people are utterly helpless. As long as the army is well fed, warm and well clothed, it will continue to be the most popular employment in Russia.

Carrying out its general plan of socialization, the Bolshevik government stripped army officers of rank, and in doing so, tried to live up to the constitution forbidding the bourgeoisie entering the army. However, this theory, like many others, did not work out in practice. Skill in military direction is indispensable to an effective military machine. Facing civil war, with the "Red" army alone between the government and disaster, Lenin and Trotzky found it expedient to ignore the constitution. It was necessary to have trained men as officers, and the bourgeoisie to whom they had denied citizenship and the honor of defending the republic, were called upon to advise the army.

Albert Rhyse Williams is a devoted friend of Lenin's. He was so enamored with the Bolshevik movement that he offered to join the "Red" army. He has written a biography of Lenin, from which I quote:

He (Lenin) sent an automobile with "Red" guards to the fortress of Peter and Paul to fetch part of the counter-revolutionary staff in prison there.

"Gentlemen," said Lenin, as the generals filed into his office. "I have brought you here for expert advice—Petrograd is in danger. Will you be good enough to work out the military tactics for its defense?" They assented.

"Here are our forces," resumed Lenin, indicating upon the map the location of the "Red" troops, munitions and reserves. "And here are our latest reports upon the number and disposition of the enemy troops. Anything else the generals desire they will call for."

They set to work and toward evening handed him the result of their deliberations. "Now," said the generals, ingratiatingly, "will the premier be good enough to allow us more comfortable quarters?"

"My exceeding regrets," replied Lenin; "some other time, but not just now. Your quarters, gentlemen, may not be comfortable but they have the merit of being safe." The staff was returned to the fortress of Peter and Paul.

I have given this excerpt from the life of Lenin, not because the incident is important, but because it illustrates the difference between Bolshevik theory and practice. I am not criticizing Lenin's good sense in promptly abandoning the foolish theory he wrote in the constitution—I am trying to emphasize the foolishness and impracticability of the theory.

So in the very beginning of the experiment called Bolshevism, its leaders broke their promises and treacherously struck down the people's convention, the constituent assembly. Evidence of their breach of faith is found in the first proclamation issued by the Bolshevik government.

Second, they commanded the peasants to seize the land, and by so doing they gave sanction to dishonesty.

Third, they sent democratic methods and machinery to the scrap pile and built the Soviet machine, a plan of gov-

ernment which robbed the people of all say in their own affairs.

Fourth, they founded their government on force, the right of might.

Fifth, they delivered the power to a class of office-holders.

Sixth, they discriminated against the "poor peasants."

Seventh, they disfranchised good Russian men and women, whose only fault was that they were thrifty and industrious.

Eighth, they destroyed freedom of speech and of the press.

Ninth, they stood for revolution and blood, instead of political action and evolution.

Tenth, last but of the greatest moment, the Bolshevik government built its national house on the dangerous foundation of minority rule. One evidence of the minority rule in Bolshevik Russia is found in the 1919 registration of voters in Moscow and Petrograd. It is estimated that Moscow has a population of almost a million and a half, yet out of this great number only 13,600 voters registered. Petrograd, with a population of between 600,000 and 750,000, registered a little less than 15,000 voters. These two cities are admitted to be the strongholds of Bolshevism. The registration figures show that about one per cent of the people of Moscow and Petrograd are sufficiently attached to Bolshevism to register.

Bolshevism snuffed out the light in Russia when it killed freedom. It did not destroy thought. It has not

conquered the manhood and womanhood of Russia; it has but disarmed them.

Somewhere I have heard or read that tolerance is a quality of freedom; that intolerance is a symptom of despotism. Maybe I am thinking of the Greek conception, the idea of Plato. Surely, tolerance is no part of the Bolshevik program. In a letter addressed to the workers of Europe and America, dated January 21, 1919, Lenin wrote:

Now, no conscientious working man and no sincere Socialist can fail to see what shameful treason against socialism was perpetrated by those who, in line with the Mensheviks of Russia, with the Scheidemanns and Suedekums of Germany, with the Renaudels of France, and Vanderveldes of Belgium; with the Hendersons and Webs in England, and with Gompers and Co. in America, supported their bourgeoisie in the war of 1914-1918.

Another paragraph from the same letter:

Side by side with these cowardly pennywise mongers who are stuffed with the prejudices of bourgeois democracy, side by side with these Socialists, who yesterday defended "their" imperialistic governments, and who to-day confine themselves to platonic "protest" against "military intervention in Russia," side by side with them, we see in the Allied countries an increase in the number of those who have chosen the communist road.

Lenin attacks Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, and the labor movement of America, for loyalty to our country in the hour of her greatest trial. Lenin brands every soldier and sailor

who offered his life to stop the Kaiser and his Prussian machine in the mad effort to conquer the world, a supporter of the bourgeoisie. Lenin assails and condemns the manhood of the world that answered the "help" cry of Belgium when Prussia was raping and murdering Belgium in the front yard of Europe. What would have happened to Russia if these brave men whom Lenin now assails had not offered themselves? Russia would have been lashed to the Kaiser's chariot, Christ chained to a Krupp gun.

The first of all the Bolsheviks will not go down in history as—"Lenin the Tolerant."

CHAPTER XIII

CLASH OF FACT AND THEORY

ON November 10, 1917, the Bolshevik government came into existence. One month later a decree was issued abolishing the private ownership of land and decreeing all the land the property of the state. On February 10 the government issued a decree declaring all state loans, internal and foreign, null and void.

The Bolsheviks wrote their revolutionary reform into the constitution:

For the purpose of attaining the socialization of land, all private property in land is abolished and the entire land is declared to be national property and is to be apportioned among the agriculturists without any compensation to the former owners in the measure of each one's ability to till it.

This was at least a fulfillment of the promise of their economic program. It was communism through confiscation. The peasants in Russia seized the land. They did not have to be persuaded to follow this command of the constitution. But they did not take the land as users, as the constitution contemplated. They took it as owners. They are not communists. Their experience with communal land ownership had been unsatisfactory. Under the old régime these peasants were allotted land by

the communal Mir. In the Mir the tenancy of a farmer was temporary and uncertain. The average length of the lease was about thirteen years. Drawings were held and the land distributed by lot. With a new drawing the peasant was compelled to move to the new strip of land allotted him. This plan took from the peasant much of his inducement to put his best work into the land. He had little incentive for improving the land, for it was not his. At the next drawing it would probably go to another, and he in turn would be shifted to a piece of land which might have been neglected and allowed to deteriorate. The peasant's irritating experiences with communism created an intense desire in him to own his own land, to have a permanent home, something to work on and to work for. I do not believe there is a country in the world where the desire for private ownership of land is as deeply rooted as it is in Russia.

So at the outset of the Bolshevik program we find the Soviet government attempting a communistic program completely antagonistic to the peasants. Between the villages in Russia are great landed estates, the proprietary lands which are the best in the vicinity and well cared for. When the order to seize the land was given, the peasants turned to the proprietary lands. The villages fought with each other for possession and division of these splendid estates. This was the beginning of general disorder, small civil wars. The government itself had immorally decreed land larceny, the example was being followed.

The government attempted to force its program abol-

ishing the private ownership of land. The leaders tried to justify the confiscation by saying that the earth belonged to the people; that private title to land was immoral and corrupt; that every man should have all the land he could actually work and not one acre more. They argued that if a man had more land than he could work, one of two things would happen, either he would allow his surplus land to remain idle, which would be waste, or he would hire some one to work it for him. These leaders said the hired man would be either a farm laborer or a tenant, and whichever relation he bore to the owner of the land he would be compelled to turn over part of his labor to the land owner. If he was a renter, the rent would be the landlord's profit, in the language of the Bolsheviks the "exploitation" of the tenant, while if a farm laborer, the wages he received would represent something less than the full product of his toil. This, too, would be to the profit of the employer and, again, in the language of the Bolsheviks the "exploitation of the worker."

The Bolsheviks argued that their plan of land communization would make better citizens, that the hired man, made a land user, would be given an inducement to work. But the title to the land was not to be his, nor was the product of his toil to belong to him. He was to work for the state. The state was owner and boss. In theory the peasant was to work for the common good of all—a fine bit of idealism, but unfortunately entirely contrary to human nature. The success of the plan depended upon human beings.

Two things resulted. One class of peasants worked the land just enough to produce what they and their families needed, for they reasoned, "Why should we work after our needs are supplied?" This not unnatural attitude of mind reduced production. Of course, it was a selfish attitude, but human nature has not evolved out of the self-interest stage. The theory which the Bolsheviks promised would increase production on the land, in practice decreased production.

Another class of peasants worked hard, produced much, but refused to give up the product of their labor to the state. They insisted that the result of their labor belonged to themselves.

Both classes were individualists. When they seized the land under Lenin's decree they were individualists and took it for themselves. Before the revolution they were individualists and the big cry of their lives was against the system which deprived them of the right to own the land they tilled and the product that came from it through their toil. The peasants, like most other people who have anything, are not communists in practice, when the operation of communism affects their own holdings. It may be and probably is an ugly, unfortunate truth, but it is a truth just the same, that the overwhelming majority of the human race are selfish, at least to the extent of wanting the personal joy of acquiring and owning property.

For a time those peasants who had a surplus sold their products to the government. In payment they received paper money of very doubtful value. Then began the

hoarding of farm products. The peasants refused to deliver their gain in exchange for questionable paper. They demanded in exchange for their farm products manufactured articles which they needed. The government did not have the manufactured articles with which to buy the farm products. The proletariat of the cities was hungry. It was up to the Bolshevik government to feed them or fall. Whatever support the government had was in the cities. Raiding parties of the "Red" Guard were ordered to the country and directed to seize the grain. The peasants not only believed in private ownership but they united to fight to protect their private property. The story of the "Red" army's invasion of the country to loot the peasants' stores will some day be told in detail, and it will furnish an interesting chapter of tragedies.

The socialization of land never had a chance for success in Russia. Lenin and Trotzky were compelled to repudiate their program and abandon land communism. Receding from its plan of land socialism the Bolshevik government made an effort to use the proprietary estates on a coöperative plan. The problem of feeding the proletariat of the cities still remained. When inducements failed threats were made in an effort to get the peasants to work the proprietary estates for the government. Graft, inefficiency of administration and the refusal of the peasants to work the estates caused the failure of this plan.

Kerzhenstey, in *Izvestia*, an official Bolshevik news-

paper, of January 22, 1919, gives the following picture of the situation:

The facts describing the village Soviet of the Uran borough present a shocking picture which is no doubt typical of all other corners of our provincial Soviet life. The chairman of this village Soviet, Rekhalev, and his nearest co-workers, have done all in their power to antagonize the population against the Soviet rule. Rekhalev himself has often been found in an intoxicated condition and he has frequently assaulted the local inhabitants. The beating up of visitors to the Soviet office is an ordinary occurrence. In the village of Bierezovka the peasants have been thrashed, not only with fists but have been assaulted with sticks, robbed of their footwear and cast into damp cellars, on bare earthen floors. The members of the executive committee, Glakhov, Morev and Makhov, and others, have gone even further. They have organized "requisition parties" which are nothing else but organized pillagings, in the course of which they have used wire-wrapped sticks on the recalcitrants. The abundant testimony verified by the Soviet committee portrays a very striking picture of violence. When these members of the executive committee arrived at the township of Sadomovo they commenced to assault the population and to rob them of foodstuffs and other household belongings such as quilts, clothing, harness and so forth. No receipts for the requisitioned goods were given and no money paid. They even resold to others on the spot some of the bread-stuffs which they had requisitioned.

This is the testimony of a leader high in the councils of the Bolshevik government.

Latzis, a Bolshevik partisan, reported in the official *Izvestia* of January 5, 1919, that "In the Velizh county

of the province of Vitebsk they are flogging the peasants by the authority of the local Soviet committee."

In the Bolshevik newspaper *Severnaya Kommuna* of May 10, 1919, a Bolshevik official, Krivoshaye, remarks:

The Soviet workers are taking from the peasants chickens, geese, bread and butter without paying for it. In some households of these poverty-stricken folk they are confiscating even the pillows and the samovars and everything they can get their hands on. The peasants naturally feel very bitter toward the Soviet rule.

The peasants' borough meeting of the province of Kostroma forwarded a resolution to Lenin saying:

The members of the Soviets are ruling us; they are violating our will and are tantalizing us as if we were dumb cattle.

Latkin, a "Red" army soldier returning from a journey through several counties in the province of Moscow, gave to *Izvestia* on May 7, 1919, the following description of the frame of mind of the peasants, which he described as very gloomy:

The peasants are dissatisfied with the war, are against the "Red" army and therefore give protection to deserters and persuade the soldiers not to obey orders. The middle peasants are beginning to coöperate with the village capitalists in their resistance to the Soviet authorities.

The tyranny of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been nationwide. The peasants have been the victims. In the Moscow *Izvestia* of May, 1919, was published the following letter from the province of Vitebsk.

Of late there has been going on in the village a really scandalous orgy. It is necessary to call attention to the destructive war of the scoundrels who work themselves into responsible positions. Evidently all the good and unselfish beginnings of the workingmen and peasant authorities were either purposely or unintentionally perverted by these adventures in order to undermine the confidence of the peasants in the existing government in order to provoke dissatisfaction and rebellion. It is no exaggeration to say that no open counter-revolutionary or enemy of the proletariat has done as much harm to the Socialist Republic as charlatans of this sort. Take, as an instance, the third district of Vitebsk in the county of Dekiashkov. Here the taxes imposed upon the peasants were as follows: P. Sloukov owning seventeen desiatins¹ was compelled to pay a tax of 5,000 rubles, while U. Zoprit, owning twenty-four desiatins, paid only 500 rubles. S. Grigoriev paid 2,000 rubles on twenty-nine desiatins, while Ivan Tselov paid 8,000 rubles on twenty-three desiatins.

The writer after quoting other instances of discrimination adds that the soil was alike in all cases.

Vopatin of the province of Tambov writes to the *Izvestia* as follows:

Help! We are perishing! At the time when we are starving, do you know what is going on in the villages? Take for instance our village Olkhi. Speculation is rife here, especially with salt, which sells at ten rubles a pound. What does the militia do? What do the Soviets do? When it is reported to them they wave their hands and say, "This is a normal phenomenon." Not only this, but the militiamen, beginning with the chief and including some communists, are all engaged in brewing their own alcohol, which sells for seventy rubles a bottle. Nobody who is in close

¹ Two and seven-tenths acres equals one desiatin.

touch with the militia is afraid to engage in this work. Hunger is ahead of us, but neither the citizens nor the "authorities" recognize it. The people's judge also drinks, and if one wishes to win a case one only needs to treat him to a drink. We live in a terrible filth. There is no soap. People and horses are suffering from skin diseases. Epidemics are inevitable in summer. If Moscow will pay no attention to us, then we will perish. We had an election for the village and county Soviet, but the voting occurred in violation of the constitution of the Soviet government. As a result of this a number of agents of capitalists who under the guise of communists entered the party in order to avoid the requisitions and contributions, were elected. The laboring peasantry is thus being turned against the government, and this at a time when the hosts of Kolchak are advancing from the east.

The peasants are hiding their rubles, holding them for a day when they hope that the blight of communism will pass and some democratic government will reorganize Russia, bring order out of chaos, establish freedom. Their Safety Deposit Boxes are empty bottles into which the peasants stuff their paper rubles and then bury the bottles in the ground. They are waiting for the day when a stable government will redeem these paper promises which to-day are of little value. It is proof of their lack of trust in the Soviet government, a trust forfeited when the government repudiated its foreign obligations and confiscated all private property in Russia.

The Constitution of the United States says:

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Every citizen in America enjoys the right of Private Property when he owns the tools with which he works, and banks his savings. He enjoys the right of private property when he buys a home, when he puts his earnings into a shop, when he becomes an employer. The right of private property enables the working man to become an employer. In this way American Industry has been built up.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FAILURE OF THE SOCIALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

THE Bolshevik government seized industry; the working men took over the factories. It was part of the plan of communism. The promise was that the socialization of industry would increase production and free the workers from exploitation. The owners and managers were driven from the plants. These men were of the bourgeois class. They had no place in the new scheme of things. They were "tainted" with success. They had intelligently and efficiently built up their industries. That was enough. The Bolshevik denied them citizenship and drove them from the enterprises they had built.

Everything was to be owned in common; private property of all kinds had been abolished. The men who worked in the factories or mills were to be their own bosses. They were part of the state, and the state owned and operated everything. The government of the factory was to be by committee, every man was the equal of every other man; orders were given and orders taken with this thought in mind. The result was insubordination. Every man was boss; all system vanished; system made slaves—Down with system! The business brains having been driven out, insubordination having

come in, production declined until it almost ceased. Many workers gave up in disgust and returned to their villages. The exodus from Petrograd was marked. Prior to 1915 Petrograd was a city of nearly 2,000,000. In 1918 its population had shrunk to less than 800,000. Factories closed. Again the theory of communism, when put to the test, failed.

The official organ of the trade union of Petrograd, the *Trud* of April 28, 1919, in discussing the closing down of nineteen textile mills gives the following reasons for the economic crisis:

"Of great significance in our textile crisis is also the inefficient using of what could be used, as the productivity of labor has dropped to nil, while there is not even a hint of labor discipline and the machines have become useless as a result of careless handling, and their productive capacity lowered."

A similar situation developed in Moscow according to the official Bolshevik newspaper, *Izvestia*, of April 3, 1919:

At a conference of the main administrative board of textile enterprises, the question of closing down textile factories was discussed. As the result of the debate it was resolved to consider inexpedient the closing down of factories, to recommend as necessary only the partial closing down in dependence upon local conditions and the situation of the various enterprises of the textile industry.

It was also resolved to take measures to preserve the basic groups of workmen in these enterprises and to establish them in necessary work during the period of the closing down of factories. It was also resolved to use the period of

closure to make repairs and lay in supplies of raw material and fuel, and also to use these workmen for agricultural work. The question of closing down all textile industries will be decided finally at a joint conference of representatives of the main administrative board and of the trade union of textile workers.

A striking result of the disorganization of the textile industry as printed in *Izvestia* of February 6, 1919, follows:

The official estimate of cloth needed for Moscow for 1919, its population being given as 600,000 adult males, 700,000 adult females, and 300,000 children, is as follows:

	Arsheens ¹
Heavy cloth.....	2,366,670
Light cloth.....	12,116,670
Cotton cloth.....	52,066,670

¹One arsheen equals 28 inches.

During September, October, and November altogether 5,000,000 arsheens of cloth have been issued to the population, which is considered one third of the actual needs.

Other branches of industry were collapsing in the late autumn of 1918 at the very moment when it was claimed that the "constructive period" had arrived in Soviet Russia.

The quantity of benzine is so small that Providink, one of the largest manufacturing enterprises of Russia, has only enough to last for two months; the factories of Bogatyr are still more inadequately supplied with rubber. The stocks of rubber are barely sufficient for another two months of production. The number of workmen employed has fallen from 32,000 to 7,500.²

²From the official Bolshevik newspaper, *National Economy and Finance*, November 12, 1918.

Transportation has almost completely broken down in Russia. Fifty per cent of the Russian steam and sailing mercantile marine was not in a condition to resume navigation at the beginning of 1919, on account of the lack of workers, fuel and the decrease in labor productivity. Altogether 1407 steamers were registered and 2446 other boats.

The railways are going to pieces in the literal sense of the phrase; locomotives have been scrapped at a disastrous rate and few are being produced.

At a meeting held in connection with the strike at the Putilov factory, Zinoviev said that from August, 1918, to February, 1919, the factory had turned out only five locomotives. For the year 1918 the factory had cost the state a deficit of 58,000,000 rubles.³

The report of the commissariat of railroads shows that there were only 250 locomotives in commission in Soviet Russia in August, 1919. Of these twenty-one were operating on the Nicholas railroad.

Out of thirty-three cement factories existing in Russia only fourteen are in a position to be used, but on account of the shortage of fuel none of these factories are working at present. The reserves of cement amount to 1,080,000 tons, whereas formerly the annual production amounted to 18,000,000 tons. If fifty per cent of the present actual annual production of coal were used for the production of cement, only three factories could work, thus producing the annual output of 1,600,000 tons. These facts are upon the authority of the official

³ *Severnaya Communa*, March 15, 1919.

Bolshevist newspaper, *Economy and Finance*, of November 12, 1919.

The economic organization of Russia has completely broken down under the baneful influence of communism. Were it not for the fact that the Bolshevik government inherited large stores of everything from the reign of Czar Nicholas conditions would be even worse than they are. The fact of importance is that communism decreased production, for this is the test of the practicability of the scheme. I quote two Bolshevik authorities:

There is an unprecedented decline of productivity in mills and factories. We must combat this resolutely. (*Severnaya Communa*.)

Organized labor has never been accused of being capitalistic. From the accredited representatives of union labor of Russia comes a highly illuminating appeal:

To W. A. APPLETON, President, December 12, 1919.
International Federation of Trade Unions.

Statement by the Workers' Delegation—Ijevski and Vodkinska Factories.

This delegation, which arrived at London on December 6, 1919, has by general consent of the workers of Ijevski and Vodkinska Factories, and by the resolution passed at the sitting of the Ural's Trade Union on June 15th, the following mission to perform:

To inform the citizens of England concerning the present condition of Russia and the Russian working class.

We come forward as non-party representatives of working men, and we do not wish to involve ourselves in English party politics. We turn to you in the first place as the repre-

sentatives of a non-party labor organization, and ask you to give us your co-operation in the fulfillment of our mission.

We have up to now given no interview to the English press. We wish to declare hereby that we are ready to answer all direct questions, both in meetings and the press, and if necessary, to answer them before the Bureau of the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam.

In submitting this statement we appeal in the name of justice to international democracy.

(Signed)

YPOVALOV, President

Vodkinska Union Metal Workers.

STRUMELOV, Member of

Directorate of Metal Workers' Union,
Perm.

JANDERMOV, Vice-President

Federated Trade Unions of Urals.

MENSHEKOV, Member of

Executive Committee Ijevski Union of
Organization.

The following supplementary statement is made by the delegate from the Vodkinska workers:

The causes of the rising against the Soviet rule by Ijevski and Vodkinska peasants and workmen it is my wish to explain:

People reading and hearing the thunderous logic and blatant rhetoric of Lenin, Trotzky and their associates, but unfamiliar with the actual state of affairs in Russia, are not in a position to understand it. They may think that the party which is fighting against Soviet rules, as established by Lenin and Trotzky, consists of the bourgeoisie and the old reactionary group. To emerge from this illusion it is necessary to master the history of the situation. It is necessary to listen to the voice of the real Russia.

We recognize that Russia economically lags behind other nations; that Russian manufacturers are in their early stages of development, and from economic laws it is certain that where there are not manufactures there can be no working classes, consequently there can be no bourgeoisie.

In Russia, out of 180,000,000 inhabitants, 150,000,000 are peasants and about 20,000,000 are workers. Then we hear the Bolshevik talk about "power for the peasants and workers." But is that what they have brought about? No. The voice of real Russia proclaims to all the world the following story:

The Bolshevik established their power by bayonets and broke the strength of peasants and workers, broke the elected assembly, which was on the principle of universal, direct-equal and secret voting—broke all the societies of a democratic nature, such as the Zemstvos, that self-governing body elected by universal, direct and secret voting. The Bolshevik, ruthlessly, like autocratic gendarmes, killed all labor, political and socialistic organizations, throttled the labor press, as for instance, its organ of the Social Democrats and Social Republicans, and finally the Bolshevik established by degree the dawn of their own Czarist socialism.

Who split up the reserve funds of the trade unions? The Bolshevik. Who split up the trade unions as a class? By whose orders were all strikes put down by force of arms and amid plentiful executions? It was the Bolshevik who broke the workmen's co-operative societies and converted their shops into communal stores. The Bolshevik promised the Russian people bread, peace, and freedom.

Actually, in place of peace they gave civil war, which destroyed all manufacture and stained every side with blood; in place of freedom, prison, exile, and the shooting party; in place of bread, famine, and the grave. So it was, that having drunk to the full the cup of humiliation and tasted this red-bayonet socialism, Ijevski and Vodkinska recognized

that further life of this sort was impossible, and though without arms, and armed only with the armor of right, with only their blistered hands to fight with, united in spirit, to a man they rose against the oppressors, and by virtue of their strength of will, snatched the rifles from the hands of the "Red" Guard and began the battle for citizens' rights and the freedom of the Russian people.

The reader asks why Bolshevism holds out so long if the peasants and workers are fighting against it. This is the true answer: All the world knows that the Bolsheviki concluded peace with Wilhelm, disarmed the Russian army, and with the Germans, began to shoot down the workers and peasants. All the time their chief power has rested in Magyars, Chinese, Letts, Czar's gendarmes, capital criminals, and communists.

All these dark forces, armed to the teeth, are driving under threat of death, father against son, brother against brother, and the Russian people, who bore the first brunt of the mailed fist of Teutonic junkerdom and in the first place saved France and all Europe from destruction's bite, now bleeds in the struggle against it, and looks to allied democracy all over the world, in its turn, to save Russia.

(Signed) YPOVALOV.

A supplementary statement by the member for Ijevski factory follows:

We, Ijevski and Vodkinska workers, who raised the standard and took arms against Bolshevism are anxious to give our story to English workers and to English newspapers. We wish to explain the reason which led to our revolt, for we cannot at present understand why part of the English Press regards the Bolsheviki as the friends of trade unionism. We Russian workers have found that the Bolsheviki turned out enemies to trade unionism as big as the capital-

ists of the Czar's time. We are ready to give you details of the horrors which we workers have lived through under the régime of their despotic sway. We will give you the story of the decline of Russian productivity, and with it the eclipse of the industrial classes.

We took up arms against our oppressors in the name of the duty which we owe to Labor's flag, for which hundreds and thousands of its loyal defenders have died in our part of the world.

(Signed) MENSHEKOV.

Trotzky, in confessing the failure of the Bolshevik program successfully to socialize industry, charged it to the "sabotage of the intellectuals." By this he meant that the Bolsheviks drove the specialists, the technicians and managers of industry, out of business; that the workingmen, not having the training for places requiring special skill and knowledge, were unable efficiently and successfully to carry on the business. Having pointed out the cause of the failure, he presented a remedy. He said with truth that the intellectuals have the benefit of special training, education, and experience, and that shops and factories filled with machines, material, and workingmen, cannot be run without the skilled manager, the intelligent, experienced foreman. But Trotzky has not lost faith in the plan of industrial communism, nor has he lost belief in the theory that it can be made to increase production. He says that the bourgeoisie, when forced by the state into the factories, do not work with the same ambition to make success as they did when they had a personal-profit interest. This he

calls the "sabotage of the intellectuals." To eliminate this difficulty he proposes that the Bolshevik government turn its attention to the education of the working men, provide technical schools and schools teaching business management, and in this manner create competent managers and technical experts. It is Trotzky's opinion that workingmen educated to be experts and managers would retain their class sympathy and their interest in the success of the class struggle.

The Bolsheviks are strong on theory. Trotzky fails to take into consideration some simple fundamental truths. He fails to reckon with human nature as it is. He thinks of it as it should be. Let us take an example which illustrates and emphasizes the difference between Bolshevik theory and practical experience. Let us suppose that the Bolshevik government establish schools for the purpose of training men in business management and for technical work. Then enroll in these schools workingmen who, at the time of their entrance in the school, are entirely "class conscious" and ardent communists. They attend school for several years. The time spent there and the education given to the men make a change in them. They become conscious of the power of education, of their fitness for a better class of work. Education gives them a sense of superiority, and I do not mean superiority in the arrogant or boastful sense. The trained mind is conscious of training. It is a more ambitious mind. The men are not less human. They want from education its material benefits. They feel the sense of leadership. When they graduate, these men

leave the door of the school different men in aspirations and ambitions. Take them back to the factories and in nine cases out of ten it will be found that education has made managers, foremen, experts out of them, and that they are class conscious but of a different class, not the one they came from when they entered school but the class they graduated into through education. There will be some few whose great idealism will inspire them to go back into the shop and work for the common good. Such men are the exceptions to the rule. The majority will insist upon recognition of their greater skill and demand compensation for it. Their thought is "Now that I am skilled and educated, now that I take on my shoulders a large and more important responsibility, I am entitled to increased consideration and a larger reward. Why should I be put on the level with the men who haven't the capacity I have and who do not shoulder the same responsibility I do?"

Trotzky's plan reminds me of the intensely maternal hen, who after practicing on white door knobs, discovered some eggs in a barn, and with great enthusiasm began to set. In the course of time her patience and motherhood were rewarded. As soon as her brood was able to walk she took them on an excursion to the river bank to give them a worm banquet. When she reached the water edge she was startled at seeing her young ones paddle into the water and without even so much as a good-by, swim off.

The test of the communist theory is whether or not, when put into practice, it increases production. The

theory of the communist is that it will increase production by inducing men to work because they are their own bosses and are guaranteed an equal share in the production. The practical fact which upsets the theory is that human beings are moved to work by their desire for gain. Human beings have this strain in their blood. It is organic; it is a part of them. I do not refer to greed. I mean that all experience proves that human beings are individualists. The average man thinks of himself and his interests a dozen times to the one time he thinks of the general interest of society. This is true even of the man who devotes thought and has much concern for the common good. He may be generous to a fault, but he wants to acquire and then give it. Competition, notwithstanding all the theories of the idealists to the contrary, quickens life, stimulates men to work, makes for progress. Everywhere about us we see in our daily experiences evidence of this fact. Life is a gamble in the sense that everything is uncertain; life itself is uncertain. No man can plan or program his to-morrow. It is the effort of man to provide against unfavorable contingencies, to compete with chance, which makes him basically a competitor with every other man.

Take the poker game. Men who play the "national" game will tell you that they play for the fun of the game, not for the money, and they are speaking the truth. Make an experiment, play a game for matches instead of for money, and observe the effect upon the ambition and skill of the players. Maybe it should not be so, but we are not dealing with "should not be's."

The life problem must be handled from the point of view of things as they are.

While the theory of communism is beautifully ideal, human beings are not. The ugly fact is that selfishness is at the bottom of nearly all personal endeavor. It stimulates men to work. It is the will to work.

Two years' experience with communism in Russia proves that the experiment is a failure. It disorganized life, demoralized people and diminished production. Instead of curing poverty, it made poverty universal. Instead of removing the cancer spot—Poverty—from the body of civilization, communism is causing decreased production, is making the entire social body a cancer.

CHAPTER XV

THE ABUSE OF POWER

SOVIET government has been a costly experiment. Russia is almost succumbing to the treatment; notwithstanding the success of the "Red" army in the field, conditions in Russia are growing from bad to worse. The Soviet leaders are drunk with power and have conducted themselves in the manner of drunken men. Reckless waste, intolerant officiousness, greed for spoils, are the record they have made. The Soviet government is a political machine, and communism has not changed its character or its methods. It has simply given it larger opportunities for spoils. Greater security in its corruption.

The *Socialdemocrat* prints some interesting extracts from the Bolshevik budget for 1919.

According to this newspaper, the revenue for the first half of 1919 amounted to 20,350,000,000 rubles, and the expenditures to 50,703,000,000 rubles, making the deficit for the first six months of 1919 of Soviet Russia the enormous sum of over 30,000,000,000 rubles. The acquisition of foodstuffs and necessities of life has created a deficit of 5,000,000,000 rubles, and the railways 4,500,-000,000 rubles; thus a half year of Bolshevik rule cost more than Russia's total outlay on the whole war.

The report of the Bolshevik Nemensky on the audit of the central Soviet commission in charge of all textile factories, which appeared in the *Sovetskaya Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn* of February 25, 1919, follows:

The finance credit division of the central Soviet commission received up to February 1, 1919, 3,400,000,000 rubles. There was no control of the expenditure of moneys. Money was advanced to factories immediately upon demand and there were cases when money was forwarded to factories which did not exist. From July 1, to December 31, 1918, the central Soviet commission advanced on account of products, to be received, 1,348,619,000 rubles. The value of the goods securing these advances received up to January 1, 1919, was only 143,716,000 rubles. The negligent way of doing business may be particularly observed from the way the central Soviet commission purchased supplies of raw wool. Up to January 1, 1919, only 129,803 poods of wool was acquired, whereas the annual requirement is figured at 3,500,000 poods.

The tremendous staff of officials (about 6,000 persons) employed by the commission are in the majority of cases doing nothing useful. It appears that there were on the payroll of this institution 125 persons who actually were not in the service at all, but who were receiving salaries. There were cases where the same persons received salaries twice for the same period. The efficiency of the officials is negligible to a striking degree.

Such Soviet institutions, Nemensky says at the end of his report, are a beautiful example of deadening bureaucracy and must be liquidated.

It would seem that the idealists in charge of the communist program in Russia are experts in "graft-ring"

methods. Payroll padding is among their accomplishments. An innocent bystander might suspect some of these Soviet officials of having a leaning toward private property, particularly when it is in easy reach.

Probably it is fair to the Bolsheviks to state their situation in their own words. The bulletin of the central executive committee of the Soviets, No. 15 (1919), announces:

We have created extraordinary commissaries and extraordinary commissions without number. All of these are, to a lesser or greater degree, only mischief-makers.

The toiling population see in the squandering of money right and left by the commissaries and in their indecent loudness and profanity during their trips through the districts, the complete absence of party discipline.

People's Commissar Lunacharsky, according to the *Severnayna Kommuna* of March 23, 1919, declared:

The upper stratum of the Soviet rule is becoming detached from the masses, and the blunders of the communist workers are becoming more and more frequent. These latter, according to statements by workmen, treat the masses in a high-handed manner and are very generous with threats and repressions.

The Soviet machine has had its "run in" with the workers. The factory committees have been bulldozed. The Soviets have been brutal in their treatment of the proletariat.

"The struggle between the Soviets and the committee of factory workers is an ordinary occurrence," according

to the Bolshevik newspaper *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn* of April, 1919.

The Soviets have the whip hand in their controversy with the workers; they are the government and the "Red" army backs their decrees. There is a final court of settlement for all disagreements between the Soviets and the workers. It is the "wall"—and the firing squad. The right to strike is denied the workers. Many of those who dared strike have paid with their lives. The workers are without recourse when commanded by the Soviet. Whether or not they were the slaves of the machines before communism came, it is certain they are now the slaves of the Soviets. Even as slaves of the machines and the capitalists who owned the machines, they had the right to strike for their rights. The Soviets deprived them of this right.

The Bolshevik Sosnovsky, reporting on the condition in the Tver province, in the *Izvestia* of the provincial Soviet March 9, 1919, wrote: "The local communist Soviet workers behaved themselves, with rare exceptions, in a disgusting manner. Misuse of power is going on constantly."

The conduct of the Soviet commissaries is a general scandal in Russia and is described in No. 12, January 18, 1919, of the *Izvestia* of the provincial Soviets:

The commissaries were going through the Czaritzin county in sumptuous carriages, driven by three and often by six horses. A great array of adjutants and a large suite accompanied these commissaries, and an imposing number of trunks followed along. They made exorbitant demands

upon the toiling population, coupled with assaults and brutality; their way of squandering money right and left is particularly characteristic. In some houses the commissaries gambled away and spent on intoxicants large sums. The hard-working population looked upon these orgies as complete demoralization and failure of duty to the world revolution.

These pen pictures of life in Russia under the Soviet régime are not furnished by the enemies of Bolshevism; they are the complaints of Bolshevik leaders. Do we need a greater warning of the menace of Bolshevism?

A BOLSHEVIST'S DYING CONFESSTION

Nicholas Lopoushkin gave his life to the cause of Russian freedom. For almost a quarter of a century, he stood up under the tortures of Siberia; solitary confinement and the drudgery of the salt mines did not break the spirit of revolution in him. He was an active leader in the Bolshevik revolution. At its conclusion he was made president of the Soviet in his native city of Kirsanov, in the province of Tambov. Eighteen months of Bolshevik terror did what twenty-four years of penal exile failed to do. It shattered his dream, broke his faith, and maddened him with its horrors. He tried to stem the tide of blood and suffering which Bolshevik methods turned loose on his country. He dared to call a halt on the program of violence. His colleagues charged him with being lukewarm to the cause, with lacking revolutionary energy. Knowing that these complaints had been sent to Moscow, he addressed, on April 24,

1919, the following letter to the national Soviet of people's commissars:

Comrades: My colleagues of the Kirsanov Soviet are writing to tell you that I am no longer fit to hold the position of president of the Soviet, that I am a counter-revolutionary, that I have lost my nerve, and am a traitor to our cause. Perhaps they are right—I only wish I knew. In writing this letter I have no wish to justify my behavior or exonerate myself in your eyes. I am too old a servant of the Revolution to plead at the bar before men who were not born when I was serving my first sentence in a Czarist prison. I think also that my past speaks for itself and that no one of my comrades will have the audacity to accuse me of insincerity or want of stability, or of making a hasty decision. After twenty-four years spent in exile, in close confinement, in every kind of revolutionary work and in different form of expiation for the same, I escaped abroad, and became an ardent Bolshevik and a sincere believer in the doctrines of Lenin and his party. But of my late experiences in Petrograd and Moscow, whence I have just returned, coupled with the horrors of the ghastly nightmare of the sort of existence which I found on my arrival in my native town, have combined to shake my faith in the suitability of Bolshevism for our country, and as a consequence, in the logic and stability of Bolshevik theories and tenets in general, which we have signally and dismally failed to prove. Speaking frankly, we are, in my opinion, on the brink of a terrible disaster, which will leave its imprint not only upon socialism but upon our nation for centuries, a disaster which will give our descendants the right to regard us Bolsheviks at the best as crazy fanatics, and at the worst as foul imposters and ghastly muddlers, who murdered and tortured a nation for the sake of an unattainable Utopian theory, and who, in our madness, sold our birthright amongst the people for less than the proverbial mess of pottage.

All around me, wherever I look, I see unmistakable signs of our approaching doom and yet no one responds to my appeals for help; my voice is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness. In the towns I have just come from, chronic hunger, murder, and the license and libertinage of the criminal elements, who undoubtedly hold numerous executive positions under our Soviets, have reduced the population to the level of mere brute beasts who drag out a dull semi-conscious existence devoid of joy to-day and without hope for the morrow. Surely this should not be the result of the earthly paradise which the Soviets were to introduce into our lives.

Everywhere people are living under the dread of famine, death, torture, and terror, everywhere groaning in utter misery. My countrymen, whom I love, and whom I have hoped to assist, to render happy above all nations, look at me either with the mute uncomprehending eyes of brutes, condemned to slaughter or else with the red eyes of fury and vengeance. It is these latter whom I fear; they are so certain that we Bolsheviks are in the wrong, that as soon as they can do so without fear of punishment, they will kill me, in the firm conviction that they are thereby doing their country a service. It is terrible, and there must be something wrong somewhere. While our brethren in the big cities are starving, the whole population in our district is engaged in distilling pure alcohol from surplus grain in their possession, grain which we cannot find, and which no amount of threat or punishment will ever make them give up.

Speculation is rife amongst even the most humble inhabitants in the country villages, who have forced a lump of sugar up to four rubles and a pound of salt up to forty rubles. And the Bolshevik militia and Soviets, when called upon to deal with various infringement of the Bolshevik decrees, either try to get out of taking action altogether or else pretend that there is insufficient evidence to commit for

trial. As a matter of fact these men, too, are tired of the position of outcasts and lepers amongst their fellows, which service with the Bolsheviks imposes on them and would gladly give up their official status, were it not for the fact that they have now cut themselves off from all return. If they fall singly or even in couples into the hands of the villagers, they are always murdered. No member of the "Red" Guard dares risk his life by returning to his native village, where his father will be the first to kill him. I maintain that there must be something wrong with a régime which has aroused such universal hatred, in such a comparatively short time and amongst whom? Amongst the very class it strove to uplift, to free, to benefit, and to render happy I have been closely connected with this region all my life, and it is no exaggeration to say that the peasant population never felt one hundredth part of the hatred and hostility towards the representatives of the czarist régime and the gendarmes that it does toward us members of the Soviets and our militia. Our aims have been misunderstood, our actions have been misinterpreted, and once we have failed to win the support of the very masses we set out to save, we may as well confess that our failure has been complete. There is a curse upon our party. Ruin and desolation follow in our train. The innocent blood of thousands cries out for vengeance against us. Our doom is fast approaching. Counter-revolution stalks openly amongst us, the gaunt spectre of utter famine and complete nakedness mocks us in the towns and villages alike. But worst of all is the consciousness of failure; we, the would-be liberators of the world, who are execrated openly by the populace; we, who can see no safety in the grim looks and expectant glances of our guards; we, whose names are used by the dregs of the town as the foulest epithets; we, who set out so confidently to climb to the sun and have ended by falling into the cesspool in our own backyards. I was always against the "Red

Terror" and bitterly shall we pay for it. Not thus did we plan in Paris, Geneva, and Luzerne; not for this did we swelter and freeze alternately in czarist prisons in Siberia or rot in salt mines. This is not the end we had in view when we risked our lives, breaking our prisons and traveling illegally across the whole of Russia, to pass the western frontier. Then we were always upheld in our weak moments, in our privations, and in our sufferings, by the thought of our glorious cause, by picturing to ourselves the day when we should free this great and glorious nation of ours and take our place as old and tried revolutionary veterans at the head of our countrymen in their triumphant march towards peace, progress and plenty. This is what we visioned and the actuality is what I have already described. I feel tired and depressed. I know that the "Red Terror" was a mistake, and I have a terrible suspicion that our cause has been betrayed at the moment of its uttermost realization.

Yours in fraternal greeting,
N. LOPOUSHKIN.

This was his last act for the cause of free Russia; after finishing the letter he committed suicide.

CHAPTER XVI

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

THE Bolshevik government is not a national government. It has never pretended to be a scheme of government for Russia alone, it has openly avowed its purpose to destroy the existing order of society by inciting the workers of the world to tear down the governments of their own countries, and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat in which the nations of the world are to be but units in an International. Russia is the nucleus. According to the Bolsheviks, patriotism is a means of exploitation and must be relegated to the scrap heap of superstitions.

Lenin, at Petrograd in 1918, declared that "the chief task to which we set ourselves at the very beginning of the war was to turn the imperialistic war into a civil war." Lenin knows no right except might; his one weapon is force. For over two years he has tried with force to break down the will of the Russian people, and compel them to accept communism. Lenin has not been contented with beating the Russian people into submission, his plan is to force communism upon the world. He has branded all existing governments as vile, and commanded the workers everywhere to arise and seize

the governments of their own lands, calling upon the men to be strong of heart and not be afraid of blood. He has denounced political action, scoffed at parliamentary methods and decried peaceful voting. His command to the workers is: "Arm yourselves and disarm the bourgeoisie." He leaves no room for doubt as to the meaning of his command. He wrote the aim and object of Bolshevism into the Soviet constitution when he defined the fundamental task as being the "Victory of socialism in all lands." He blazoned his war cry on the coat of arms of the Soviet government in these words: "Workers of the world, unite."

Bucharin, the leading Bolshevik propagandist, Chairman of the Third International, set forth the purpose of the Communists.

"The program of the Communist party (the Bolsheviks) is the program of the liberation of the proletariat not only in one country, it is the program of the liberation of the proletariat of all countries, because it is the program of *international revolution*. The overthrow of imperialistic government by means of armed revolt is the road to the international dictatorship of the working class."

In his New Year's message for 1920, Lenin boldly asserted: "There will be Soviets at Berlin, Washington, Paris, and London. Soviet authority will be supreme throughout the world."

In May, 1919, the Bolshevik authorities officially proclaimed: "Long live civil war, the only just war, in which the oppressed class fights its oppressors."

The Bolsheviks have a single foreign policy. It is to create strife among the people of the world, develop what they call "class consciousness," crystallize hate, and promote the organization of civil wars. This is preliminary and prepares the way for the world revolution. Lenin has repeatedly said and written that the Bolshevik government in Russia cannot succeed, if the present governments of the world are permitted to exist. These are Lenin's words:

There is no doubt that the socialist revolution in Europe *must come* and *will come*. All our hopes for the definite triumph of socialism are based upon this conviction.

The plan to bring about world revolution has been carefully worked out. Propaganda has carried the message to every corner of the world. Bolshevik gold has been used unsparingly. Moscow is the capital of the world movement to bring about the upheaval. A proclamation was issued on February 24, 1919, calling upon the proletariat of the world to send delegates to a Communist International at Moscow. This was to be the first organization of the new world government. It was financed, organized and controlled by the Bolshevik dictators. The call for the Third International defined the groups in the various countries that were eligible for representation in the Third International. In America it invited the Socialist Party (especially the group represented by Debs), the I. W. W., and the Socialist Labor Party to send delegates.

The followers of Debs were honored with first place

among those considered fit to have a voice in the Third International. Debs, who on four different occasions, was the Socialist candidate for President of the United States, wrote in the "Appeal to Reason," September 2, 1911: "Let us marshal our forces and develop our power for the revolt. . . . A few men may be needed who are not afraid to die. . . . Let us swear that we will fight to the last ditch, that we will strike blow for blow, that we will use every weapon at our command and that we will never surrender."

Victor Berger, the first and only Socialist congressman, in a signed editorial in the *Social Democratic Herald*, July 31, 1909, says:

In view of the plutocratic law-making of the present day, it is easy to predict that the safety and hope of this country will finally lie in one direction only—that of a violent and bloody revolution. Therefore, I say, each of the 500,000 Socialist voters and of the 2,000,000 working-men who instinctively incline our way, should . . . have a good rifle and the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home and be prepared to back up his ballot with his bullet if necessary.

The I. W. W. have never denied that they seek to destroy the labor union movement in America, and in its place build a single union, and that the object of one great union is not industrial, but political, and that the aim and purpose of such a union is to seize the government. The International Workers of the World is a mobilization plan in the guise of a labor union. Its record in the United States is distinguished by violence and

terror. The I. W. W. are made preferred citizens of the United States by the Bolsheviks, and because of their eminent qualifications are invited to become "world citizens" in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Socialist Labor Party, the third group asked to represent America in the Third International, is made up of "Left-Wingers"; and the "Left-Wingers" in the Socialist Party are those who favor a "Red" baptism to cleanse the world of the sins of the pale Socialists, who prefer political action and peaceful voting to the torch, the bullet, and the bomb.

The call of the Third International is the declaration of the dictatorship, and in it we find announced the essentials of their program.

1. The present is the period of destruction and the crushing of the capitalistic system of the whole world, and it will be a catastrophe for the whole European culture, should capitalism with all its insoluble contradictions not be done away with.

2. The aim of the proletariat must now be IMMEDIATELY to conquer power. To conquer power means to destroy the governmental apparatus of the bourgeoisie and to organize a new proletarian governmental apparatus.

3. The new apparatus of the government must express the dictatorship of the working class (and in certain places even the dictatorship of the half-proletariat in the villages, that is, the peasant proletariat), that is, to persist in the systematic suppression of the exploiting classes and be the means of expropriating them. No false bourgeois democracy—this treacherous form of the power of a financial oligarchy with its mere external equality—but a proletarian democracy able to realize the freedom of the working

masses; no parliamentarism, but the self-government of the masses through their elective organs; no capitalistic bureaucracy, but governing organs which have been appointed by the masses themselves, through the real participation of these masses in the governing of the country and the socialistic work of reorganization—such ought to be the type of the proletarian state. The Soviet power or a corresponding organization of government is its concrete expression.

4. The dictatorship of the proletariat must be the occasion for the immediate expropriation of capital and the elimination of the private right of owning the means of production, through making them common public property. The socialization (meaning doing away with private property and making it the property of the proletarian state, which is managed by the workers on a socialistic basis) of the large-scale industries and the central bodies organized by the same, including the banks, the confiscation of the capitalistic agricultural production, the monopolization of large-scale commerce; the socialization of the large buildings in the towns and in the country; the establishment of a workingmen's government and the concentration of the economic functions in the hands of the organs of the proletarian dictatorship—are the most essential aims of the day.

5. In order to protect the socialist revolution against external and internal enemies and to assist the fighting proletariats of other countries, it becomes necessary entirely to disarm the bourgeoisie and its agents and to arm the proletariat.

6. The world situation demands immediate and as perfect as possible relations between the different groups of the revolutionary proletariat and a complete alliance of all the countries in which the revolution has already succeeded.

7. The most important method is the mass action of the proletariat, including armed struggle against the government power of capitalists.

The Third International met at Moscow from March 2 to March 6, 1919. It adopted a manifesto which was signed by Lenin and Trotzky, the leading spirits of the Congress. This Manifesto has been distributed all over the world. In one particular at least, it can be commended, and that is, for its astonishing frankness. It boldly boasts that its message is revolution, and that its mission is to organize and mobilize a "Red" army in every country in the world. Under the caption, "The Way to Victory," the Manifesto reads:

The revolutionary era compels the proletariat to make use of the means of battle which will concentrate its entire energies, namely, mass action with its logical resultant, direct conflict with the governmental machinery in open combat. All other methods, such as revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentarism, will be of only secondary significance.

The Manifesto declares that the First International foresaw the future development and pointed the way; that the Second International gathered together and organized the proletariat; that the Third International is the International of open mass action, of revolution, the international of deeds. The work of the Third International is mapped out in the Manifesto in these words:

The task of the International Communist Party is now to overthrow this order (all present governments) and to erect in its place the structure of the Socialist world order. We urge the workingmen and women of all countries to unite under the communist banner, the emblem under which the first great victories have already been won.

Proletarians of all lands! In the war against imperialistic barbarity, against monarchy, against the privileged classes, against the bourgeois state and bourgeois property, against all forms and varieties of social and national oppression—UNITE!

Under the standard of the Workingmen's Councils, under the banner of the Third International, in the revolutionary struggle for power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarians of all countries, UNITE!

The Communist International in its appeal "to the toilers of the world" says:

The communist revolution grows. The Soviet republics in Russia, Hungary, and Bavaria report daily what has been accomplished. Germany is shaking with civil war. A revolution is taking place in Turkey. In Austria and Czechoslovakia the workmen are gathering under the glorious flag of socialism. In France enormous demonstrations have started; in Italy the struggle boils and the workmen call for a dictatorship of the proletariat. In England strikes have taken on the character of an epidemic. In America the working class come out on the street; in Japan the workmen are agitated. In the neutral countries, like Holland and Switzerland, hundreds of thousands of workmen recently took part in a political strike. The workmen of all countries have understood that the decisive moment has come. Soviets, by this you will conquer.

The workmen know that only a dictatorship of the proletariat can save humanity from that bloody horror into which the bourgeoisie in all countries has plunged it. The workmen know that the proletarian dictatorship will lead to a triumph of socialism. There is no middle course. Either the bloody dictatorship of executioners-general, who will kill hundreds of thousands of workmen and the peasants in the name of the interests of a band of bankers, or the dicta-

torship of the working class, that is of the overwhelming majority of toilers which will disarm the bourgeoisie, create its own "Red" army and free the whole world of slavery. Down with the autocracy of czars and kings!

The *Severnaya Kommuna* of March 14, 1919, reports a speech made by Lenin at the Petrograd Soviet on March 12, 1919:

We can understand the activities of the Council of People's Commissaries for the last year only if we assess the rôle of the Soviets on the scale of world revolution. Often the daily routine of administration and details that could not be avoided in the work of construction are pushing us to one side and forcing us to forget the greater task of world revolution. But only when we assess the rôle of the Soviets on the world scale shall we be able properly to handle the details of our internal life and regulate them properly. The task of construction depends entirely upon how soon revolution will triumph in the more important countries of Europe. Only after such a victory shall we be able seriously to undertake the work of construction. The expert accountants from Berne speak of us as the champions of the tactics of violence, but in referring to this they do not see what the bourgeoisie is doing in their own countries, namely, that it is governing exclusively by violence.

The Bolshevik government has declared war upon the world. In its propaganda it seeks to organize and incite the discontented of the world to mob violence. It is a propaganda of hate. It has scattered broadcast in the soil of unrest poisonous seeds. It has played to every prejudice, appealed to the lowest and worst in men. It has falsely spoken of the World War as the enterprise of capital. It has cunningly charged the terrible shedding

of blood to imperialism, not to the imperialism of Prussia, but to the capitalistic imperialism of the world. It has listed the ill effects of the war and placed the blame for them not on the war but on the capitalists. It has pointed to the poverty and the disorganization of the world directly due to the war, and has attributed all the tragic results of a four year's struggle with autocracy, not to the war, but to the imperialism of so-called bourgeois governments. It has sought to multiply and intensify unrest. It hopes to bring about a world upheaval which will destroy all government except the disorder of the proletariat.

Lenin insults those who do not accept his gospel of world revolution. He is particularly bitter toward socialists who advocate the ballot and oppose the bayonet. Those who favor evolution are the enemies of mankind; those who seek a new order through peace are targets for his abuse.

Writing of the military program of the proletariat revolution, in the November, 1919, number of the *Class Struggle*, Lenin says:

Whoever in view of this last war is not willing to carry out this demand (mass action, open battle, and revolution) let him be good enough to refrain from uttering large words about the international revolutionary democracy, about the social revolution, and about the war against wars.

Of those who have denounced militarism and demanded disarmament, Lenin wrote:

What will the proletariat women do to prevent this? Merely denounce all wars and militarism? Merely demand

disarmament? Never will the women of an oppressed and revolutionary class resign themselves to so despicable a rôle. On the contrary, they will say to their sons: "You will soon be grown*up. You will have a gun. Take it and learn how to use it—not in order to fight your brothers, as is the practice in this war of plunder, but in order to fight the bourgeoisie of your own country; in order to put an end to misery and wars; not by means of kind wishes, but by overthrowing and disarming the bourgeoisie."

The Third International followed the Bolshevik government in every particular, it deified Lenin and Trotzky, it banished Christ and set up Marx as the Omnipotent One. It pledged allegiance to the Marxian formula: "Religion is the fantastic degradation of human nature."

Karl Marx, the prophet of Socialism, the Messiah of Bolshevism wrote:

Modern industrial labor, modern subjection to capital . . . has stripped him (the proletarian) of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests. . . . THE WORKING MEN HAVE NO COUNTRY.

In Bolshevik Moscow, the meeting place of the Third International, the doors of many churches are nailed shut, and on the doors of the Cathedral of Vassily Blagenny, and upon the image of the Blessed Virgin, a poster announced: "Religion is the opium of the people."

On his way back from Holland to Russia, Dr. Oudendijk, the Dutch minister in Petrograd, said:

I wish to give a solemn warning to the working classes of all nations. Bolshevism, I say without exaggeration, is the

end of civilization. I have known Russia intimately for twenty years, and never have the working classes of Russia suffered as they are suffering at the present moment. I have never seen or dreamed of the possibility of such corruption, tyranny, and the absence of all semblance of freedom, as there are in Russia at the present moment.

Mme. Catherine Breshkovsky is the greatest figure in the history of the Russian Revolution. She lived for the Russian people, and she gave all she had of soul, mind, and body, to mothering liberty in Russia. No woman in all the history of the world has endured more for a people, for their freedom, than this hero woman who spent thirty-two of her seventy-three years of life in Russian and Siberian prisons. She is the Saint of the Revolution, her life embodies the struggle of Russia. In the *New York Times* of January 26, 1919, she said:

It is a calamity, not alone for Russia but for the world at large, to permit Bolshevism to flourish and expand. . . .

The situation in Russia is deplorable. There is no exaggeration in cable dispatches which state that our people are literally starving to death. There is bread in some places, but not in all. There are no means of transportation; the railroads have completely broken down. The people in the cities who have some supplies refuse to sell anything. We have no clothes, no tools, no instruments, no medicine, and little or no food. The stocks in the coöperative stores of the villages are almost totally depleted.

At the start the Bolsheviks had the people with them. They promised peace, bread, clothes, education—they gave, ah, they gave only money, and that to themselves. We Russians are ashamed to say that, rich as our country is, we are beggars.

The farmers will not sell to the Bolsheviks, consequently many of the people of Russia are starving. We have no schools, no communication, no transportation, no bread, no peace, no industry—Russia is destroyed. Not even paper have we to print our alphabet. Consequently, education is at a standstill. Even the newspapers have been suppressed, except those of the Bolsheviks. You in America know nothing save what they tell you; the truth is suppressed. . . . The only hope for Russia is the overthrow of the Bolshevik forces and the election of a Constituent Assembly.

BOLSHEVIST PROPAGANDA CANNOT BE SILENCED BY FALSEHOOD

What is the Russian situation? A minority has seized the government and is holding it by force. The great majority of the people in Russia are in the position of a group of unarmed men in a public meeting confronted by a small band of armed terrorists. Radek, a prominent Bolshevik, has said:

I am one who does not deny that there has been terror in Russia. The government had to adopt drastic measures to keep the hungry, disgruntled, war-weary millions in leash.

Russia is in the throes of civil war. On the one hand we find the “Red” Army, on the other the great mass of the people, even though unarmed, rising in protest against the dictator. Lenin himself admits that his policy is one of coercion by force and violence. In his address to the American workingmen he declares:

In reality a class struggle in revolutionary times has always inevitably taken on the form of a civil war, and civil war is unthinkable without the worst kind of destruc-

tion, without terror and limitations on the form of democracy. One must be a sickly sentimentalist not to be able to see, to understand and appreciate this necessity. The class struggle is permanent. We are living in revolutionary times. In order to fight the class struggle effectively in such times, in order to get power and keep it, civil war, terrorism, etc., are necessary. Here is the whole doctrine.

No less an accurate observer than Gorky interpreted the reign of terror in 1918:

In Russia conscience is dead. The Russian people, in fact, have lost all sense of right and wrong. "Pillage whatever there is to pillage," is the motto of the two groups of Bolsheviks. The "Red" Guard, constituted to attack the counter-revolutionists, shoot without right anyone whom they suspect. Pillage in all its forms is the only thing which is organized. In Petrograd every Bolshevik citizen may share in the spoil.

For the period of revolution 10,000 lynchings have already (up to 1918) been accounted for. This is how democracy is meting out justice to those who have somehow sinned against the new order.

During the days of the progress of drunkenness, human beings were shot down like dogs and the cold-blooded destruction of human lives came to be a commonplace, daily occurrence. In the newspaper *Provda* the excesses of the drunken mobs are written up as the "provocative acts of the bourgeoisie," which is clearly a misrepresentation, the employment of a petty phrase which can lead only to the further shedding of blood.

A look, a word, constitutes a crime in the Soviet state; the punishment is frequently death; the accused is denied the right to face his accusers. The language of the Bol-

shevist decrees is: "Execute them on the spot." In the first month of the Lenin government "Extraordinary Committees to Combat Counter-revolution, Speculation, and Sabotage" were introduced. Immediately the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission ordered the "merciless shooting of all opposed to the Soviet government by detachments of the Commission at the place of the crime."

This is the Russia of the Third International. These are the methods of the men who are appealing to the discontented. They have invented fine-sounding phrases in which are concealed the seeds of death.

President Wilson summed up our danger in a statement made in the office of M. Pichon at the Quai D'Orsay, Paris, on January 16, 1919, at the conference called for a preliminary discussion regarding the situation in Russia. The notes of the conversations of the conference participated in by Lloyd George, Balfour, Pichon, and Baron Sonnino give the substance of the President's ideas in the following words:

The President did not believe that there could be sympathy anywhere with the brutal aspect of Bolshevism, if it were not for the fact of the domination of large vested interests in the political and economic world. While it might be true that this evil was in process of discussion and slow reform, it must be admitted that the general body of men has grown impatient at the failure to bring about necessary reform. The President stated that there were many men who represented large vested interests in the United States who saw the necessity for these reforms and desired something which should be worked out at the Peace

Conference, namely, the establishment of some machinery to provide for the opportunity of individuals, greater than the world has ever known. Capital and labor in the United States are not friends. Still they are not enemies in the sense that they are thinking of resorting to physical force to settle their differences. But they are distrustful, each of the other. Society cannot continue on that plane. On the one hand there is a minority possessing capital and brains; on the other a majority consisting of the great bodies of workers who are essential to the minority, but do not trust the minority and feel that the minority will never render them their rights. A way must be found to put trust and coöperation between these two.

President Wilson pointed out that the whole world was disturbed by the question before the Bolsheviki came into power. SEEDS NEED SOIL, AND THE BOLSHEVIST SEEDS FOUND A SOIL ALREADY PREPARED FOR THEM.

Prior to the break-up of 1914 the working people had doubts about their ability to secure free, decent lives through political action. The war and depression have crystallized these doubts, and the war shock has quickened eagerness for action. The desire for a change is more than agitation. It has grown into determination and resolution. Since the war the suspicion of the radical wing of the working class that powerful "interests" would and could defeat them on the field of political action has become a conviction.

Had the allied governments met the situation with candor and common sense they would have used every available agency to tear the mask from the Bolshevik government and to show the working people of the world

the true character of that government and the methods used by it.

The allied governments contented themselves with telling the people that Bolshevism was a bad, dangerous pitfall. It seems to me that it would have been a wiser policy to throw the searchlight on the Soviet plan and expose it. The Soviet constitution should have been used as propaganda. It requires little comment. The story of the Third International and its aims and objects should have been given to the world. It was useless to fight falsehood with abuse, fire with fire. We should have fought fire with water, propaganda with truth, cunning with frankness. A plan should have been devised to bring the truth about this evil home to men and women. The people of the world are sane and democratic. They know a danger when they see it, and if they had been given a chance to know and see the danger of the "Red peril" they would have shunned it as they avoid a contagious disease. When the "flu" epidemic broke upon the world, the pages of the newspapers told over and over again the danger of contagion from sputum and droppings, and the people speedily accepted the warning. We have had conflicting comment about Bolshevism, but little plain truth. It has been characterized and condemned. It should have been explained. President Wilson once remarked that we in America in discussing public problems generate too much heat and not enough light.

The working people have observed that a portion of the press previously allied with the "interests" and

against the rights of the people thundered out most savagely against the Bolshevik government. This class of papers denounced Bolshevism, but gave little space to the calm, cool, plain statement of the truth about it or its methods. Such papers were as yellow in their conservatism as the Bolsheviks were "red" in their propaganda. The newspapers of this class had lost the confidence of the workers. Every time such papers violently abused the Bolsheviks, it reacted upon the workers and strengthened their belief that Bolshevism was the panacea for the ills of the toilers. The Bolshevik propagandists were in a better position; the Bolshevik movement commanded the admiration and sympathy of the workers of the world because of its connection with the liberation of Russia from the rule of the Czar; the Bolsheviks appeared as the under dog in the fight, and the average man has a natural sympathy for the under dog.

Many thoughtless business men denounced Bolshevism without explaining it. Some of these employers denounced the workers in their own countries when they sought better conditions and called them Bolsheviks. To the workers it seemed that their enemies had lined up against Bolshevism, and they reasoned that "what is bad for the boss is good for us," and as a consequence their leaning toward Bolshevism became conviction. These mistakes of policy, these unwise attitudes have reacted in the minds of the workmen and I have heard many workers defend Bolshevism on the sole ground that they believed in it because of the enemies it had made.

A curtain of mystery was drawn around Soviet Russia.

Men who came out of Russia bringing reports which displeased conservative opinion were abused, and their reports were discredited without a fair hearing. Bullit, Robbins, and Steffens are examples in America. The workers at once came to the conclusion that these men had found a free government in Russia, a government which gave larger and better lives to the people; that Bolshevism was practical; that it was succeeding and that it was feared by the "interests." Of course, this is not the real story brought from Russia, but the abuse used to silence men spoke louder and more eloquently than any report.

One great London newspaper went so far as to charge the prohibition movement in the United States with being in league with the Bolsheviks, saying that the object was to increase unrest and irritate the workers by denying them alcohol, hoping that out of this restlessness would come revolution.

Other counter Bolshevik propaganda pictured the Bolshevik movement as a Jewish propaganda. This was clearly an appeal to prejudice. What difference could it make to free-minded people whether the leaders of the Soviet plan were Jews or not? The mass of the people have common sense, and saw in such propaganda another effort to make them hostile to Bolshevism by inciting race prejudice.

Then came a crack in the curtain of silence. Through it issued the startling news that the Bolshevik government planned the nationalization of women. No rumor about Bolshevik Russia was given quite the prominence

and publicity that was given to this falsehood. I have talked to many men who were bitterly opposed to Bolshevism, who in the last analysis based their opposition to it on their belief that its program included "national prostitution." One insurance company in America made nation-wide use of this canard in its advertising. Of course, it is obvious to thinking people—and it should not be forgotten that the plain people think—that no people in the world would adopt any such degenerate program. First, the nationalization of women is not necessary to any economic program. Second, one could not round up five per cent of the people of any country in the world who would subscribe to a plan which contemplated the registration and violation of their mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, and sweethearts. The Russians are human beings. The women are mothers, wives, daughters, and sweethearts. This evil and unnecessary lie about the Bolsheviks fell of its own weight. But it left an effect upon the minds of the workers. They concluded it was designed to poison public opinion against Bolshevism, and they reasoned that if there were true arguments against Bolshevism, those who opposed it would not have resorted to falsehood. Even more, the workers argued that if those who opposed Bolshevism lied about it in one particular, their whole opposition to it was a tissue of falsehood and their real antagonism was based upon the fear that the coming of the dictatorship of the proletariat would put an end to their selfish special privileges.

The origin of this yarn about the nationalization of

women grew out of the following facts: In the little city of Ufa, a drunken man made the proposal in a Soviet that it adopt such a measure, and a group in the town of Saratov, calling themselves anarchists, issued a decree in April, 1918, containing among other provisions the following:

From March 1, the right to possess women having reached the ages of seventeen to thirty-two is abolished.

The husbands may retain the right to use their wives without waiting their turn.

In case of resistance the husband shall forfeit his rights.

All women according to this decree are exempt from private ownership and are proclaimed to be the property of the whole nation.

It was unfair to charge the Bolshevik government, on this evidence, with favoring the nationalization of women.

A second piece of propaganda was sent out and given first-page space in the papers of the world. Its apparent object was to corroborate the lie about the nationalization of women. This second charge was that the Bolsheviks had decided to abolish Christian names and henceforth children would be named by number. To illustrate, the first born of the Trotzky family would be Trotzky No. 1, the second child would be Trotzky No. 2, and so on. This was printed as serious news, as truth. I have heard workingmen declare that the objects of this publicity was to set them and their families against Bolshevism, and I observed that it had exactly the opposite effect.

Would it not have been better to tell the truth about the methods used by the Bolshevik government to degrade womanhood by promulgating decrees relating to marriage and divorce, which practically establish a state of free love? The Senate committee investigating Bolshevism, after examining much evidence on the attitude of the Bolshevik government and its decrees toward the home and common morality, said: "Their effect has been to furnish a vehicle for the legalization of prostitution by permitting the annulment of the marriage bond at the whim of the parties, recognizing their collusive purposes as a ground for the severance of the matrimonial state." It should be borne in mind that these are but the decrees of the Soviet government and are shunned and despised by the Russian people. These decrees are important only as indicating the brutal immoral ideas of the dictators.

Frederick Engels, who collaborated with Karl Marx, in the writing of the plan and program of Socialism wrote:

"Three great obstacles block the path of social reform: private property, religion and the present form of marriage."

The Allies' course has caused the workers to increase their suspicion of their government. A conviction has come that Bolshevism is being cried down, libeled, slandered, abused, and fought because its success threatened the death of special privilege and promised the birth of the "New Order."

We should not be afraid of the Bolshevik propaganda.

We have the truth with us. Why not use our resources to give the facts about Bolshevism to the people? There is no occasion for secrecy or mystery. Few people in America would entertain Bolshevik leanings if they understood its program and knew its methods. The press, the pulpits, the platforms are available. Open the schools, the churches, the libraries, and the community centers and tell the truth about Bolshevism.

CHAPTER XVII

INTERMEDDLING IN RUSSIA

THE attitude of the Allies toward the Soviet Government has tended to create and increase world unrest. Before we can hope for industrial peace in the world a definite policy toward Bolshevik Russia must be adopted. This is a problem for statesmanship. Expediency, intrigue, and vacillation must give way before world-patriotism.

Unfortunately for the people of the world, the Allied governments have been without a definite policy toward the Soviet Government. Their attitude has been one of uncertainty; at times a purposeless antagonism to Bolshevism, again a spurious support. From the beginning the Allies have opposed the Soviet form of government, but their opposition has taken no constructive form; it has led to nothing; it has amounted to a disorderly scheme of interference, a general plan of annoyance. The peace table has been without a north star. It has steered without a compass. It has been without a definite objective. It has been at sea, adrift, so far as a policy toward Russia is concerned.

At first we were told that the Allies would intervene and save the Russians from the rule of violence imposed

by the "Red" Army under the command of Lenin and Trotzky. The Allies did not intervene; they did worse, they intermeddled. Worst of all, the Allied governments failed to keep the public fully and frankly advised as to what the Bolsheviks were doing and planning. The masses in ignorance of the real meaning and purposes of the Bolshevik government, not having been shown that it was a government of a small minority, that it was built on force, that the rule of might prevailed, that violence was the law, that terror was the order, that a dictator was the ruler, turned to the thought that the Soviet government was the beginning of the changed order for which they had been looking and working.

Pretended saviors arose in Russia, Denikin, Kolchak, Petura and Yudenich. These men were heralded in the Allied press as patriots, seeking to deliver the Russians from the yoke of violence and autocracy fastened on them by Lenin and Trotzky. While the Allied governments did not openly and officially favor these counter-revolutionary movements in Russia, they furnished arms and money for these uprisings. The phrase "self-determination" had been gradually taking root in the minds of the people. No phrase in our time has so seized upon the thought of the world. Here was a violation of the fundamental meaning of the message America gave to the world through President Wilson and which the Allies adopted as their promise to the world.

Then came stories that some of these "White Hopes" were brigands, adventurers, reactionaries. The only reason that could be offered for the Allies' giving support

to these revolutionaries was that they were against the Bolsheviks. Being against the Bolsheviks did not constitute a good and sufficient reason in the minds of the people of the world.

Gradually the public learned that Admiral Kolchak was a reactionary. It leaked out that he was surrounded and supported by the favorites of the old régime; that his object was to reëstablish the rule of the nobility in Russia. Reports showed that his aids were the Cossack generals, Semenoff, Kalminkoff, and Rozonoff. The world knew of these Cossack generals. They were formerly a part of the Czar's terrorists. Now that the Czar was dead and they were no longer on his payroll they had become mercenaries, and had seized upon the revolution as an opportunity to loot and pillage. From American soldiers (part of our expeditionary forces in Siberia) I learned that while the Russians in Siberia were opposed to Bolshevik violence and Soviet rule, they were even more bitterly opposed to a government headed by these hated Cossack generals. The British government gave special aid to Kolchak, while privately and secretly Lloyd George admitted that Kolchak was a reactionary. On January 16, 1919, at a conference of the Allied leaders in Paris, the official minutes of the conversations report that Lloyd George said:

Moreover, from information received, it would appear that Kolchak had been collecting members of the old régime around him and would seem to be at heart a monarchist. It appeared that the Czechoslovaks were finding this out. The sympathies of the Czechoslovaks are very democratic and

they had not been at all prepared to fight for the restoration of old conditions in Russia.

The Paris conference declared that 8,000 American soldiers and an equal number of Japanese soldiers should enter Siberia for the purpose of saving the Trans-Siberian Railway. This military occupation was not given authority to loot, nor was it authorized to enter Siberia for the purpose of conquest. When Major General Graves led the American Expeditionary Force into Siberia he found the Japanese army there in great numbers. Instead of the 8,000 authorized by the Paris conference, Japan had nearly 70,000 soldiers in Siberia. It was understood that the use of the railroads by the American and Japanese military should be confined to military uses alone. The truth is the Japanese used the railways to carry out spoils. Japan has been penetrating Siberia. Siberia is rich in gold, platinum, timber, furs, bristles, coal, and salt. Generals Rozonoff, Semenoff, and Kalminkoff have been betraying and peddling their country to the yellow masters of the Far East. We will have to reckon with Japan's boldness and ambition. The Allies gave courage to her effrontery when they turned Shantung and 40,000,000 Chinese over to Japan. Shantung is the commercial heart of China; it is, as well, its soul. It is the cradle of her great prophet, Confucius. The ex-Kaiser, through a friendly compact with the late Czar Nicholas, seized Shantung. When the World War came, Japan sat on the fence. France and England urged her to go in with the Allies. She did, but only after she had

received her price. By private agreements with France and England, German rights (truth would have written them German wrongs) in Shantung were turned over to Japan. This betrayal of China's freedom was made in secret. America was kept in the dark as to the arrangement. Balfour came to America and told us many things, but nothing about this secret compact. We induced China to cast her lot with the Allies. All China asked was that when Germany was conquered and driven out of Shantung, that China be given back her own, Shantung. When the war ended President Wilson in Paris sought to restore Shantung to China. Japan objected and presented her claim. She based it on the secret agreement with England and France. For the first time America learned of this secret bargain. Finally and unfortunately we consented to give Japan the determination of Shantung. We struck the word "self" out of the phrase "self-determination." No single act has so shocked the world as this deal.

Let America take her troops out of Siberia; let us leave Russia alone. She will find herself sooner if we do. Let us stop encouraging Denikins, Yudenichs, Peturas, and Kolchaks. Let us by our policy convince the Russian people and the world that we believe in self-determination and that we want the Russian people to have a chance to solve their own problem. With the end of revolutionary movements in Russia, one reason for the existence of the "Red" Army will disappear. The majority in Russia want a free, democratic government. They will get it if they are left to themselves.

I asked two important Slav leaders for their opinion as to the policy the world should adopt toward the Bolsheviks and the Russian problem. In Prague I spoke to President Mazayrik of Czechoslovakia; in Warsaw I interviewed General Pilsudski, Provisional President of Poland. Both answered the question in practically the same words: "Let Russia alone; let the Russian people solve the Russian question."

AN INSINCERE PEACE PROPOSAL

From Soviet Russia comes a plea for peace; it comes from the same lips that promised the Russian people a constitutional convention and later broke their faith with the people by dissolving the popular assembly with the bayonets of the "Red" Army. Now, the Bolshevik government extends one hand to the world and asks fellowship in the family of nations while the other hand, concealed behind its back, holds a dagger. This is the same dictatorship that began its rule by decreeing grand larceny and confiscation and for two and one-half years has terrorized Russia. It is the same Soviet Russia that called the Third International and sent forth its clarion cry to the workers of the world to unite and disarm the bourgeoisie, commanding the workers to abstain from the use of the ballot and use force in open battle against all organized authority. The same Lenin and Trotzky are at the helm, who scoff at moral obligations, who justify terror and murder by pronouncing these criminal acts "a necessary part of the world revolution." The peace proposal

is not made in good faith. It is an intrigue, a device of cunning, calculated to throw the world off guard and to give the forces of disorder more time for organization; to create a respite for the Russian "Red" Army until a more favorable hour arrives for a blow against the peace and freedom of the world.

When the Bolsheviks say they want peace and give assurances, that they wish simply to be let alone in order to work out their experiment in Russia, such offers to compromise are, it has been shown, purely tactical. After the expulsion of the Bolshevik Ambassador Joffre from Berlin, Checherin boasted of the millions of rubles taken to Russia for propaganda purposes.¹

Another illustration of the "scrap of paper" attitude of the Bolsheviks toward treaties is contained in a signed article² on revolutionary methods in which Joffre says:

Having accepted this forcibly imposed treaty (the Brest-Litovsk Treaty), revolutionary Russia of course had to accept its second article, which forbade any agitation against the state and military institutions of Germany. But both the Russian government as a whole and its accredited representatives in Berlin never concealed the fact that they were not observing this article and did not intend to do so.

That the Bolsheviks are playing an international game aimed at the subversion of all governments, is disclosed by the avowed tactics of their foreign policy. In his *Peace Program* published at Petrograd February, 1918, Trotzky says:

¹ Official note to German Foreign Office in "Zrostri," December 28, 1918.

² *Izvestia*, January 1, 1919.

If in awaking the imminent proletarian flood in Russia, Russia should be forced to conclude peace with the present-day governments of the Central Powers, it would be a provisional, temporary, and transitory peace, with the revision of which the European revolution will have to concern itself in the first instance. OUR WHOLE POLICY IS BUILT UPON THE EXPECTATION OF THIS REVOLUTION.

It is well to recall the total lack of moral sense shown by the Bolsheviks in their dealings not only with the people of Russia but with the world. They are bold and shameless in their double-dealing. Zinoviov, President of the Petrograd Soviet, in a speech delivered February 2, 1919, on the Prinkopo Island proposal said:

We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace with the Allies. . . . It would only mean that we should put no trust whatever in the bit of paper we sign. We should use the breathing space so obtained in order to gather our strength, in order that the mere continued existence of our government would keep up the world-wide propaganda which Soviet Russia has been carrying on for more than a year.

The Seventh All-Russian Congress met in Moscow in December, 1919. Trotzky reported to the Congress:

If one speaks of the conclusion of peace within the next month, such a peace cannot be called a permanent peace. So long as class states remain as powerful centers of imperialism in Europe and America, it is not impossible that the peace which we shall perhaps conclude in the near future will be for us only one long and prolonged respite. So long as this possibility is not excluded, it is possible that it will be a matter not of disarming but of altering the form of the armed forces of the state. We must pass to the militia system of armed forces.

Trotzky's report was unanimously adopted by the Congress without debate.

Theoretically, the All-Russian Congress is the supreme power of the Soviet government; at least, the constitution declares that it is. It would seem that the action of this Congress fixes the policy of the Soviet government. If anything can be binding on Lenin and Trotzky, the action of the Congress is. Then, too, the Congress only indorsed the policy advocated by Trotzky.

About a month after Trotzky's report, proposals of peace, requests for recognition, were sent to the world by the Bolsheviks. If we consider these proposals and requests in the light of the foregoing resolution, it is apparent that Lenin and Trotzky are acting in bad faith, and the only inference possible is that the Soviet government seeks time for further preparation.

CHAPTER XIX

BOLSHEVISM IN THE UNITED STATES

HAVE we Bolshevism in the United States?

Is it organized?

Is its object the overthrow of the government by force and violence?

Who are the Bolsheviks?

Have they a plan of revolution?

These questions are in the daily thought of the American people. The time has come to face the facts. If Bolshevism in the United States is a myth, we should know it and dismiss it from our thoughts. If it is real, then we should be prepared to meet it. Prevention is better than cure. Such a course saves blood and the other ugly evils which attend revolutions.

Bolshevism and socialism, as we knew the latter before the war, had one meaning in common, both were for communism, but Bolshevism seeks to realize its end by force and violence, while socialism sought the bringing about of the socialist state by the ballot, by parliamentary methods. Bolshevism is revolutionary. It preaches and practices its doctrine, force. Russia is the proof; Lenin, Trotzky, and the "Red Guard" the witnesses. Socialism has been evolutionary. The dif-

ference between these two "isms" is not in objective, but in program, the method of reaching the objective.

The Socialist Party in the United States had a definite plan. It advocated a series of distinct steps as a means to the final goal, complete communism. Its propaganda urged the reformation of the government of the United States by peaceful methods. It was a political party in the sense that it had its platform, nominated candidates for office, and waged a campaign of education to secure their election. It was as legitimate as any other party. It was acting under the constitution; while it sought completely to change the government of the United States, it sought to accomplish this aim by securing the votes of the majority of the citizens of the Republic. Socialism, whether it is good or evil, coming at the express wish of the majority would be "a government of the people, for the people and by the people." It would be government "by the consent of the governed."

Bolshevism is an outlaw. Bolshevism in the United States is criminal. The Bolsheviki in the United States advocate the bringing about of communism by force, revolution. A party advocating the use of force to change the government of the United States admits that it is a minority party. We can have government only by the minority or by the majority, and it is plain that of the two, the nearest approach to freedom is by the majority of the people. A majority of the people of the United States can change the form of government at their will. The Constitution provides an orderly, peaceful method of changing the form of government. It is true that the

Constitution wisely places certain checks upon the procedure so that sweeping fundamental changes in our government cannot be brought about in haste. The fathers of the Republic understood the dangers of rash action, but radical and fundamental changes can be made as is shown by the eighteen changes called Constitutional Amendments that have been made in our government in its life of less than a hundred and fifty years. Recently two changes have been made, both of which are vital changes in the law of the land. I refer to the amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States senators by the direct vote of the people and the new constitutional provision abolishing the liquor traffic. Whether one agrees with either or both of these recent changes in our form of government, it cannot be denied that they are the law of the land by virtue of the will of the people. Sane men do not use force to accomplish an aim which can be secured without the use of force. There can be only one reason for urging the use of force as a means of changing or overthrowing the government and that is that the proponents of the change are in the minority and as a consequence cannot accomplish their desire through the ballot.

The plan of the Socialist Party in the United States was to advocate municipal ownership of public utilities and the governmental ownership of the railroads and mines. This was the opening wedge. It did not sponsor these reforms as remedies for existing conditions, but favored them as a step toward communism. The Socialists argued that the success of municipal and national

ownership of public utilities would point the way toward government ownership of everything—communism. They preached that these victories for common ownership would give the people a chance to see the practical success of governmental ownership, even more that each city adopting municipal ownership would be territory acquired, a “Red” dot on the map. Government ownership of the railroads and the nationalization of the mines would extend socialism and consolidate and organize the victories in the cities. It would show the feasibility of government ownership on a large scale. The Socialists were not unmindful of the fact that transportation and power are the two great forces in industrial life. All industry, all business, depend upon coal, power, and transportation. Without the coöperation of these two essentials, privately owned industry could not function.

But the war changed the socialist creed. A new majority arose in the Socialist Party. It was impatient with the socialism I have described. It marked the old socialism as reactionary and referred to the dominant socialism before the war as “moderate socialism.”

The radicals in the Socialist Party, called the members of the Left Wing, were moved to action by the happenings in Russia. Everywhere in their creed, platforms, programs and methods one can see the direct influence of the Bolshevism of Russia. In fact, as we shall see, the entire plan of the new radicalism in America is identical with the plan of Russian Bolshevism. Even the same words are used, so fearful are the American Bolsheviks that they will lose something of the Russian

program if they set it forth in any terms except the original.

The first evidence that the seed of Bolshevism had sprouted in the United States was the organization on November 7, 1918, of a Communist Propaganda League and the appearance of a publication, *The Revolutionary Age*. This little group sounded the call to arms, declaring that their first battle must be with the reactionary Socialists, who controlled the Socialist Party of the United States. In February, 1919, the foreign language branches and a few of the English speaking branches of the Socialist Party issued a Manifesto. In its first proclamation the Left Wing of the Socialist Party advocated the overthrow of our government by force.

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of Scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in society, the bourgeoisie (middle class), and the proletariat (unskilled laborers, who own no property). Between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class through the seizure of the instruments of production and distribution, the abolition of the capitalist state, and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a socialist system. Revolutionary Socialists do not believe that they can be voted into power. They struggle for the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat.

In the above extract from the First Left Wing Manifesto of the Socialists of the United States, it is plain that they propose to seize industry and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. They openly avow that they have no faith in the ballot. Their belief is in revolution.

Speaking of the class struggle, this Manifesto says:

We assert with Marx that the "class struggle is essentially a political struggle," and we can only accept his oft repeated interpretation of the phrase. The class struggle, whether it manifests itself on the industrial field or in the direct struggle for governmental control is essentially a struggle for the capture and destruction of the capitalist state. This is a political act. In this broader view of the term "political," Marx includes revolutionary industrial action, in the sense that it aims to undermine the bourgeois state, which "is nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and that no less so in a democratic-republic than under a monarchy."

Marx programmed socialism; he is the great high priest of Communism. The platforms and programs, the manifestoes and pamphlets of the Communists in the United States abound in quotations from Marx. It is fair to accept Karl Marx as the interpreter, and in the above extract from the First Left Wing Manifesto, we have light on the meaning of the word "political," as used by the Communists. To them political action does not mean voting. It hasn't the same meaning to the Communists that we generally have in mind when we use the word. Marx has given the word "political" a broader meaning, saying that it includes "revolutionary industrial action" and Marx goes on to say that the object of "revolutionary industrial action" is to capture and destroy the capitalistic state. According to every Socialist, the government of the United States of America is a "capitalistic state." When we read the words "capitalistic state," "bourgeois government," "imperialistic state," we know that the government of the United States

is meant. They have said so, not once but thousands of times; not one but all of them.

The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party met in Chicago on May 24, 1919. The Committee was under fire, the Left Wingers were making a desperate fight to capture the machinery of the Party. The members of the Executive Committee were being assailed as traitors to the "cause." They were charged with having sold out the "Internationalists." The Executive Committee, meeting in Chicago, decided to purge itself of the Left Wing radicals and expelled from membership about 40,000 members. This action caused the Left Wing to issue a call on May 31, 1919, for delegates to attend a National Left Wing Convention to be held in New York City on June 21.

The Left Wing Conference met. The delegates represented over 50,000 members. This Convention carefully prepared a Manifesto and a program. In it they announced the policy and plans of the new socialism in the United States, later known as the Communist Party, and the Communist Labor Party.

No man can faithfully serve two masters, and no honest man tries to do so. Neither can a citizen of the Republic be loyal to the nation and give his allegiance to the Third International. When a man applies for citizenship in the United States, the first thing we do is to make him forswear his allegiance to his fatherland.

As the corner stone of the Left Wing program, the Convention wrote:

We favor international alliance of the socialist movement

of the United States only with the communist groups of other countries, such as the Bolsheviks of Russia, Spartacists of Germany, etc.

We are opposed to association with other groups, not committed to the revolutionary class struggle, such as Labor Parties, Non-partisan Leagues, People's Councils, Municipal Ownership Leagues and the like.

The Left Wingers not only stripped themselves of their citizenship in the United States but they declared war upon the government of the United States by adopting the Moscow Manifesto and pledging their undivided devotion to its principles. By this act they promised to arouse "the proletariat to make use of the means of battle, which will concentrate its entire energies, namely, mass action, with its logical resultant, direct conflict with the governmental machinery in open combat."

The above quotation is the language of the Moscow Manifesto and to this object they gave allegiance. Could English be plainer, the meaning bristles out of the words —mass action, direct conflict of the governmental machinery in open combat, the use of the means of battle.

The Left Wing Manifesto declares that the new socialism is a world movement. It says:

The predatory "war for democracy" dominated the world. But now it is the revolutionary proletariat in action that dominates, conquering power in some nations, mobilizing to conquer power in others and calling upon the proletariat of all nations to prepare for a final struggle against capitalism. Russia is the one country in which the revolutionary proletariat have conquered and destroyed the state. The Left Wing was the first mobilization camp in the United States

organized for the purpose of conquering the power of the American government.

There can now be only the socialism which is one in temper and in purpose with the proletarian revolutionary struggle. There can be only the socialism which unites the proletariat of the whole world in the general struggle against the desperately destructive imperialisms—the imperialisms which array themselves as a single force against the on-sweeping proletarian revolution.

And the revolutionary struggle is now. It is to follow Lenin and Trotzky's plan as outlined in the Third International. The Left Wing Manifesto makes this clear in the following language:

The revolutionary epoch of the final struggle against capitalism may last for years and tens of years; but the Communist International offers a policy and program immediate and ultimate in scope, that provides for the immediate class struggle, against capitalism, in its revolutionary implications, and for the final act of the conquest of power.

The Left Wingers charge that the World War was a war of imperialism and "unjustifiable on any pretext of national interest" and that "the dominant socialism accepted and justified the war." They insist that true socialism is international and has no obligation to national allegiance. Loyalty to any flag except the "Red" flag, Left Wingers claim is a betrayal of the proletariat. In the Left Wing Manifesto we learn:

Great demonstrations were held. The governments and war were denounced, but immediately upon the declaration of war there was a change of front. War credits were

voted by socialists in the parliaments. The dominant socialism favored the war, a small minority adopted a petty bourgeois pacifism, and only the Left Wing groups adhered to the policy of revolutionary socialism.

The dominant socialism, in accepting and justifying the war, abandoned the class struggle and betrayed socialism. The class struggle is the heart of socialism. Without strict conformity to the class struggle, in its revolutionary implications, socialism becomes either sheer Utopianism, or a method of reaction. But the dominant socialism accepted "civil peace," the "unity of all the classes and parties" in order to wage successfully the imperialistic war. The dominant socialism united with the government against socialism and the Proletariat.

The Left Wingers have broken with socialism because moderate socialism did not stand in the way of national unity during the war. It is written in this Manifesto that "it is precisely during the war that material conditions provide the opportunity for waging the class struggle to a conclusion for the conquest of power." It will be remembered that Lenin frequently spoke of changing the World War into a civil war. In other words, this new radical movement is the enemy of moderate socialism because it did not play the rôle of Judas and strike the warring governments in the back. It is plain that the World War offered an opportunity for such dastardly cowardice. The Manifesto denounces moderate socialism which it sometimes refers to as "dominant socialism" for not turning the "imperialistic war into a civil war," and charges these "reactionary social-

ists" with forgetting the Paris Commune and the Russian Revolution of 1905.

The Manifesto calls attention to the fact that dominant socialism tries to defend its "acceptance of the war on the plea that a revolution did not materialize, that the masses abandoned socialism."

To this plea the Manifesto makes this answer:

This was conscious subterfuge. When the economic and political crisis DID develop potential revolutionary action in the proletariat, the dominant socialism immediately assumed an attitude AGAINST the revolution. The proletariat was urged NOT to make a revolution. The dominant socialism united with the capitalistic governments to PREVENT a Revolution.

Bringing the charge home to the then Socialist Party in the United States the Manifesto says:

The war and the Russian proletarian revolution in Russia provided the opportunity. The Socialist Party, under the impulse of its membership, adopted a *militant* declaration against the war. But the officials of the party sabotaged this declaration. The official policy of the party on the war was a policy of petty bourgeois pacifism.

This policy necessarily developed into a repudiation of the revolutionary socialist position.

Does this sound like treason? These Left Wingers assail the officials of the Socialist Party for only betraying the country in the war hour to the extent of being pacifists. They are condemned for not going the limit. They should have become *militant*. Militant is defined in the dictionary to be "Fighting, warring, engaging in

warfare." This should have been their conduct toward the nation during the war.

Moderate socialism is criticized and condemned for having as its goal "constructive reforms," "coöperation with other classes," and for declaring "that the coming of socialism was the concern of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. In "accepting social reformism," "coöperation of the classes," and the bourgeois parliamentary state as the basis of its action, moderate socialism was prepared to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state even to the extent of defending the bourgeoisie against the working class and its revolutionary mass movement.

The Manifesto expressly condemns faith in orderly peaceful methods to attain communism and declares "the dominant socialism developed a policy of legislative reforms making a revolutionary class struggle a parliamentary process. This development meant obviously the abandonment of fundamental socialism. It meant working on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state, instead of the struggle to destroy that state; it meant the "coöperation of classes" for state capitalism, instead of the uncompromising proletarian struggle. Government ownership, the objective of the middle class, was the policy of moderate socialism. Instead of a revolutionary theory of the necessity of conquering capitalism, the official theory and practice was now that of

modifying capitalism, of a gradual peaceful "growing into socialism by means of legislative reforms."

Surely it cannot be said that the revolutionary socialists have failed to make clear their decision to use force. They have not only said so but they condemn moderate socialism for advocating "a peaceful growing into socialism by means of legislative reforms."

Commenting upon the effect of the policy of the moderate socialists the Left Wingers say:

What the parliamentary policy of the dominant socialism accomplished was to buttress the capitalist state, to promote capitalism, to strengthen imperialism.

And why?

The dominant socialism based itself on the middle class and the aristocracy of labor (all organized labor except the I. W. W.) but these have compromised with imperialism, being *bribed* by a share in the spoils of imperialism.

Every union card carrier in the United States is charged with selling his loyalty to his country during the war. How about the men who took off overalls and put on the uniform? Was he bribed by a share in the spoils. Many of them gave up good paying jobs to fight the good fight and some never came back. Were they, too, bribed? If this is not treason what is?

The Manifesto emphasizes the following essential differences between moderate socialism and itself:

Moderate socialism is compromising, vacillating, treacherous, because the social elements it depends upon—the petite bourgeoisie and aristocracy of labor—are not a fundamental

factor in society; they vacillate between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, their social instability produces political instability; and, moreover, they have been seduced by imperialism and are now united with imperialism.

Revolutionary socialism is resolute, uncompromising, revolutionary, because it builds upon a fundamental social factor. The industrial proletarian Revolutionary socialism adheres to the class struggle, because through the class struggle alone—the mass struggle—can the industrial proletariat secure immediate concessions and finally conquer power by organizing the industrial government of the working class.

The Manifesto declares that the only way to communism is the Russian road. It says that the moderate socialists “conceived the task of revolution in Germany and Russia to be the construction of a democratic parliamentary state, after which the process of introducing socialism by legislative reform methods could be initiated.”

This was the plan of Kerensky in Russia. He was as insistent a communist as any one could be, but he favored giving the people a chance to form a free government and to this end advocated a convention of the representatives of the Russian people—a constitutional convention, sometimes called a constituent assembly. A democratic government so formed could by legislation establish communism. This would be communism without a dictator, it would be an overthrow of the form of government in an orderly manner. There are but two ways in which a government can be changed—one is by the parliamentary or legislative method, the other is by

the extra-parliamentary (beyond the scope of law) method—FORCE.

The Left Wing Convention made its choice:

Revolutionary socialism, on the contrary, insists that the democratic parliamentary state can never be the basis for the introduction of socialism, that it is necessary to destroy the parliamentary state.

And to prove their contention that force is the only way to socialism they cite the case of Russia:

The proletarian revolution in action has conclusively proved that moderate socialism is incapable of realizing the objectives of socialism. Revolutionary socialism alone is capable of mobilizing the proletariat for socialism, for the conquest of the power of the state by means of revolutionary mass action and proletarian dictatorship.

The Manifesto, under the caption “Political Action,” gives us the meaning of the phrase:

The class struggle is a political struggle. It is a political struggle in the sense that its objective is political—the overthrow of the political organization upon which capitalistic exploitation depends, and the introduction of a new social system. The direct objective is the conquest by the proletariat of the power of the state.

How?

Revolutionary socialism does not propose to “capture” the bourgeois parliamentary state, but to conquer and destroy it. Revolutionary socialism, accordingly, repudiates the policy of introducing socialism by means of legislative measures on the basis of the bourgeois state.

Revolutionary socialism, accordingly, proposes to conquer the power of the state. It proposes to conquer by means of political action—political action in the *revolutionary* Marxian sense, which does not mean parliamentarism, but the class action of the proletariat IN ANY FORM having as its objective the conquest of the power of the state.

Parliamentary action is only for propaganda purposes; it is of secondary importance. The Left Wing Manifesto says:

But parliamentarism cannot conquer the power of the state for the proletariat. The conquest of the power of the state is an extra-parliamentary act (an act above and beyond the law.) It is accomplished not by the legislative representatives of the proletariat but by the MASS POWER OF THE PROLETARIAT IN ACTION.

What is mass action? How do the communists in the United States propose MASS POWER?

The Left Wing Manifesto answers both questions:

Mass action starts as the spontaneous activity of unorganized workers massed in the basic industry; its initial form is the mass strike of the unorganized proletariat.

Mass action is industrial in its origin; but its development imposes upon it a political character, since the more general and conscious mass action becomes, the more it antagonizes the bourgeois state, political mass action.

The revolution starts with strikes of protest, developing into mass political strikes, and then into revolutionary mass action for the conquest of the power of the state. Mass action becomes political in purpose but *extra-parliamentary* in form; it is equally a process of revolution and THE REVOLUTION ITSELF IN OPERATION.

The final objective of mass action is the conquest of the

power of the state, the annihilation of the bourgeois parliamentary state, and the introduction of the transition proletarian state, functioning as a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Under the heading "Problems of American Socialism" the Manifesto tells of the task to which it has set itself:

A minor phase of the awakening of labor is the trades unions organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have secured as a privileged caste. A Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would in general be what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party—reforming capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as moderate, petty bourgeois socialism,—the two being expressions of an identical tendency and policy. There can be no compromise either with laborism or with the dominant moderate socialism.

But there is a more vital tendency,—the tendency of the workers to initiate mass strikes,—strikes which are equally a revolt against the bureaucracy in the unions and against the employers. These strikes will constitute the determining feature of proletarian action in the days to come. Revolutionary socialism must use these mass industrial revolts to broaden the strike, to make it general and militant; use the strike for political objectives, and, finally, develop the mass political strike against capitalism and the state.

Revolutionary socialism must base itself on the mass struggles of the proletariat, engage directly in these struggles while emphasizing the revolutionary purposes of socialism and the proletarian movement. The mass strikes of the American proletariat provide the material basis out of which to develop the concepts and action of revolutionary socialism.

Our task is to encourage the militant mass movements in the A. F. of L., to split the old unions, to break the power of unions which are corrupted by imperialism and betray the militant proletariat. The A. F. of L., in its dominant expression, is united with imperialism. A bulwark of reaction,—it must be exposed and its power for evil broken.

The Manifesto cites two efforts that failed:

Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action, and in which the suggestion of proletarian dictatorship is apparent, the strike-workers trying to usurp functions of municipal government, as in Seattle and Winnipeg.

The general strike called in Winnipeg, May 15, 1919, was designed to overthrow constituted government by all the people and substitute government by self-constituted dictators. Resolutions adopted by a convention of secessionists from the American Federation of Labor, at Calgary, months before the strike in Winnipeg, clearly stated the purpose was to establish a Soviet government in Canada.

After a general strike of the fire department, the high pressure water plant employees, the health, light and power departments, telephone operators, postal workers, employees in the bakeries and dairies and delivery men, workers in the retail and wholesale establishments dealing in the necessities of life, the General Strike Committee issued permits allowing bread and milk deliveries in limited quantities. The Committee gave orders limiting the activities of the police and assumed the government of the city, which was the real purpose of the strike.

One illustration of permit to live government in Winnipeg under the attempted Bolshevism is sufficient:

Mr. Carruthers.

DEAR SIR:

Would be pleased to have you give a sufficient supply of milk to bearer for sick wife.

Winnipeg Trades and Labor Council.

H. G. VEITCH,
Food Commissioner.

The "bearer" sought milk for a dying wife, and was refused it by the Bolshevik employees of the Crescent Creamery Company, until he secured a permit from the Food Commissioner of the General Strike Committee. The "bearer" got the permit, but too late. His wife was dead.

When the revolutionary strike hit Seattle the city was a closed shop city, that is, it was practically 100 per cent union labor. The strike was without any cause, the workers had no grievance. The Central Strike Committee sent for Mayor Ole Hanson and told him that they were going to take over the electric light plant and that there would be no lights. The Mayor replied, "You mean to use force—well I do, too. You cannot seize the people's property unless you have more force than I have."

The strike committee closed the stores, the groceries, the meat markets, the milk depots. They tried to starve the people into submission. They tied up the street car systems, called out the teamsters. A "flu" epidemic was raging and the dead piled up because the General Strike

Committee refused to allow the dead to be buried without a permit from the committee. The newspapers were suspended. And what for? They intended to make the people suffer so much that they would submit and turn the government of the city over to the workers. It was America's first taste of the Left Wing program.

I have given the detail of the plan of the Left Wing Convention because this group in the Socialist Party later divided into the Communist Labor Party and the Communist Party, both of which, as we shall see, are at work in the United States, agitating and organizing, trying to use the present unrest in the country to foment the "deepened, broadened, political mass strike—the weapon of revolution."

On July 19, 1919, the Left Wing issued a call for a convention to be held in Chicago on September 1, for the purpose of organizing a Communist Party.

On August 30, 1919, the Socialist Party met in Chicago for the purpose of discussing the situation. The Left Wingers tried to capture the convention, the police were called in, and the Bolsheviks of the party were driven out. The expelled "Reds" divided, one group organizing the Communist Labor Party, and the other, the Communist Party. Both were the outgrowth of the Left Wing Convention. Their purposes and principles are the same.

The delegates to the Communist Labor Party assembled in Chicago in the headquarters of the Recruiting Union of the I. W. W. on September 3, 1919. The convention represented a membership of about 30,000. Upon

the conclusion of the convention the Party started an aggressive campaign, establishing several newspapers, circulating pamphlets and holding organization meetings throughout the country.

The Party adopted the coat of arms of the Bolshevik government as its emblem. It adopted the Manifesto of the Third International as its guide. It mapped out a comprehensive scheme of organization, working out every detail carefully. The constitution provides that "no member of the party shall accept or hold any appointive or public office (Civil Service positions excepted) without the consent of his state organization." The members have no allegiance to the nation; fealty is due the Party alone. And the Party wrote as the first paragraph of its program:

The Communist Labor Party of America declares itself in complete accord with the principles of the communism, as laid down in the Manifesto of the Third International formed at Moscow.

In another portion of their platform we find the following statement of what they propose to do:

The Communist Labor Party proposes the organization of the workers as a class, the **OVERTHROW OF CAPITALIST RULE AND THE CONQUEST OF POLITICAL POWER BY THE WORKERS.** The workers organized as the ruling class, shall, through their government, make and enforce the laws; they shall own and control land, factories, mills, mines, transportation systems and financial institutions. All power to the workers.

It calls the working class to "organize and train itself for the capture of state power."

The Party points to the strikes at Winnipeg and Seattle as the way to victory. "The most important means of capturing state power for the workers is the action of the masses, PROCEEDING FROM THE PLACE WHERE THE WORKERS ARE GATHERED—IN THE SHOPS AND FACTORIES. The use of the political machinery of the capitalist state is only secondary."

The program of the Communist Labor Party is a repetition of the Left Wing Manifesto and Program.

The Communist Party met in Chicago September 1, to September 7, 1919. Its 130 delegates represented a membership of over 50,000. The Party joined the Third International and took as its watchword the "Way to victory" set forth in the Moscow Manifesto.

On page 1 of the Manifesto issued by the Communist Party of America, we read: "The struggle is between the capitalist nations (the United States) of the world and the international proletariat, inspired by Soviet Russia."

This Manifesto insists that voting can never bring communism, that mass action, revolution, is the way. Follow in the footsteps of Russia. The capitalist state in America (the government of the United States), must be destroyed, and they say it should be done by the mass revolutionary political strike.

Both the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party look upon the I. W. W. as the labor base of their movement.

In any mention of revolutionary industrial unionism in this country, there must be recognized the immense

effect upon the American labor movement of the propaganda and example of the Industrial Workers of the World, whose long and valiant struggles and heroic sacrifices in the class war have earned the respect and affection of all workers everywhere.

The I. W. W. are not only the enemy of the nation but the foe of American organized labor. The I. W. W. have written their criminal record in almost every state in the union. In their song book, on page 18, we find this degenerate song:

Mr. Shark, you grafter,
You're the feller I'm after,
For I mean to comb your hair with this piece of pipe.
See the shark to me is walking,
Soon this gas pipe will be talking,
Then he'll remember me.

Vincent St. John in his "History, Structure, and Methods of the I. W. W." says:

The I. W. W. aim to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of RIGHT AND WRONG DOES NOT CONCERN US.

It was the I. W. W. that called upon the workers of America not to fight for the flag but to call general strikes and weaken the country during the war. Haywood, the father of the movement, declared: "We don't care for the flag and we are against patriotism; there is only one flag in the world for us and that is the 'Red' flag."

In November, 1916, the I. W. W. Convention in Chicago adopted this resolution:

We openly declare ourselves the determined opponents of all nationalistic sectionalism or patriotism.

By their own words we have three Bolshevik groups in the United States. They are organized and at work. They have declared war upon the government. They represent a menace to life and liberty, to peace and security. By one emblem they all swear—the “Red” flag—the danger signal of violence, treachery, and revolution. Lincoln said that a nation could not endure half free and half slave. The people of the United States are at the crossroads. Our Republic cannot go on, part of it under the Stars and Stripes, and part of it under the “Red” flag. Now is the time for the roll call. The issue must be met. There is no room for compromise. Those who seek to justify or apologize for these propagandists of terror, should be silenced. In these trying days of reconstruction patience wearies when sick sentimentalists try to condone the treason of men who seek to set our house afire.

Some prominent men and women have come to the defense of the Bolsheviks in America. They have gone farther than defending the outlaws; they have charged the government with intolerance, because loyal servants of law and order insist upon breaking up these plots against the life of the country. Some of these misguided citizens have raised the cry that free speech and the right of free assembly are being denied citizens of

the Republic. Where and when has free speech been denied in the United States? What is free speech? Surely the Constitution does not license advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence. Free speech never gave man the right to bear false witness against his neighbor. If a man, to amuse himself, cries "Fire" in a crowded theater and thereby provokes a stampede, resulting in the trampling to death of women and children, he cannot escape responsibility for his act on the ground that he was exercising his Constitutional right of free speech. If a group of men meet for the purpose of advocating the seizure of my home, urging my murder if I resist, such a meeting could not be justified under the right of free assembly nor could such criminal speech be said to be lawful free speech. When men meet in the United States and advocate the overthrow of the government by mass action they are guilty of a crime one hundred and ten million times greater than the crime of one who advocates the seizure of an individual's home by force.

Some who pretend to be good citizens complain that the government is destroying the freedom of asylum guaranteed to the oppressed of all lands, when aliens are deported, after having been adjudged guilty of advocating the overthrow of the government by force. The cry goes up that we are deporting aliens when we are deporting enemies.

It might be well for those who give of their time and prominence to the defense of the Bolsheviks and I. W. W. in the United States to give a moment's thought to

the 70,000 brave lads who sleep in France, our dead who gave all for the flag and country these outlaws seek to disgrace and destroy. It might be well to remember that the Paris Commune grew out of a "broadened and deepened strike."

CHAPTER XX

THE NEW WORLD

FROM the beginning the problem of life has been to secure enough to eat, to wear, a decent place in which to live, fresh air and sunshine, a chance to get an education, reasonable hours of work in sanitary and safe surroundings, an interest in work that robs toil of machine monotony, time for recreation and study, opportunity to know and understand and enjoy the finer and better things of life, such as the woods, the flowers, nature, music, poetry, art, the sublime works of God and man—this is the passion of the human heart, the longing of every soul, the goal of mankind's dream. It is for these things men work. These desires live in all men. Some of them do not know that these are the cravings that keep them restless. Others do not realize that without these surging impulses progress would be impossible and this would be a sad old world.

In quest of such a free life every fight has been fought, every burden carried, sacrifices have been made, martyrs have died. On this hope religion is built. The struggle for a better and nobler and happier to-morrow is throbbing in the unrest of to-day.

The human race is on its way. It knows where it is

going. It has reached political liberty. To-day men are politically free. The vote of the humblest counts as much as the vote of the most powerful. All men have an equal say in selecting their servants who make and enforce the law. Election day is common hiring day, the candidate for office is only an applicant for a job. The voters, rich and poor, have an equal voice in the hiring of the men who make up the government. The highest expression of political freedom is found in the basic principle of our government, that all just powers are derived from the consent of the governed. Achieving political liberty pointed the way to complete freedom and provided a peaceful, orderly manner of attaining it. Our political freedom outlaws force and violence.

But political freedom and actual freedom do not mean the same thing. A man can be politically free and starve and through no fault of his own. A hungry man, an overworked, an underfed man is not a free man. In the New World which is in the making men must be economically free, and by that I mean that a mere existence must give way to a real life. We must have fewer men with more than they can possibly use, and all who work are entitled to enough of the world's good to live on a plane higher than animals. Distribution must be moral and equitable. Man must be secure in his toil, free from the fear of starvation. Yes, even more, he must have his chance to look up and he has not it, when he lives in the category of a commodity. His job must be something more than a sweating place.

The problem is man—the man at the bottom. Sup-

pose he has not an education. Whose fault is that? He is still a human being and in his way, a way not of his making, he wants a human place in life. He is blood and bone and muscle and brain and nerves; he has a heart, too, and a soul, we are told. The worker marries, he assumes the blood and legal duty of making a home. Government tells him to marry. Marriage is the normal state of man, the home is the real unit of society. Religion says that it is the moral state of man. Children come. He must make a home for them, feed, clothe and educate them. He has but one thing to give the world in exchange for these things his family must have; it is his labor and in return for his toil he is handed a pay envelope. If its content is not sufficient to take care of his family what can he do? He cannot steal to make up the deficiency, for the law writes that down "Larceny." He cannot beg, for that is vagrancy. He cannot cut down the size of his family to fit his wages, for that is murder. He is up against it and his family pays the price of his bankruptcy. The world pays a still greater price—the standard of living is lowered, immorality, crime, ignorance are the by-products.

Wages and distribution are the same thing to the worker. His fight is for more wages. The employer is interested in dividends and he fights to keep the wage scale down. Both seek to use force, the worker the power of numbers, the capitalist the power of money. One says I will break you, the other replies I will starve you out. Force never settled anything. Might is a poor doctrine to follow in solving disputes between labor and

capital. Any lasting and successful solution must be based upon right, justice.

There is a basis of settlement that is moral; it is the standard of living. All of the people are interested in the standard of living in America. It is sound public policy to consider wage agreements from the point of view of a decent standard of living. Such a basis includes more than enough to eat, it embraces living rights. It makes effective the guarantee that all citizens are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The right to organize is part of the free man's liberty; economically it is part of his security. We have had many unnecessary labor wars in America over this question. The time has come for the complete recognition of this right and the recognition of labor's right to organize should be made in good faith. It will not do to acknowledge this right in the toiler and then seek to destroy his union by underhand methods. The time for right thinking and square dealing is here.

The right to strike must not be prohibited. Such a legal prohibition would not cure industrial discontent; it would only aggravate it. The right to cease work is an essential liberty given to all men by the Constitution. We must get at the cause of the strike if we are to make any headway toward peace. Back of the strike is a grievance, real or fancied. We should search it out and this requires conference, examination of the facts and a machinery to bring about justice between the parties. The peace table should be substituted for the pitched battle. Collective bargaining is only granting to the work-

ingmen a voice in their own affairs. The voices of thousands of unorganized workingmen are a whisper while the voice of an employer is a shout. Men in all walks of life use the principle of dealing through their chosen representatives and it works; our government is built on this principle. We elect representatives to act for us. Why should workingmen not have the right to pick their own representatives and deal with their employers in the making of wage scales and working conditions?

The group representing the public in the President's Industrial Conference recently wrote the following conclusion:

We believe that the right of the workers to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining with their employers, through representatives of their own choosing, cannot be denied or assailed. As representatives of the public we can interpret this right only in the sense that wage-earners must be free to choose what organizations or associations, if any, they will join for this purpose.

Property rights must be made safe; human rights must be made secure. When a clash comes between the two it is the duty of government to resolve any doubt in favor of the rights of man. Lincoln, in his annual message to Congress, December 3, 1861, wrote: "Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much higher consideration." This truth might well find lodgment in the minds of employers, when in this day of unrest they take up with their em-

ployees the question of finding a new method of adjusting differences.

The law has given more consideration to the protection of property rights than it has to the safeguarding of human beings. If a man's property is threatened with injury the courts are open to him, and upon application he can secure a writ of injunction restraining the threatened damage. Back of this writ is the full power of the government, the police, the sheriff, the militia and the army. If a worker's happiness and life, and the happiness, health, and hopes of his wife and children are menaced because his wages are not sufficient to meet the high cost of living, the law has provided him and his with no protection against a danger that is not of his making. The worker has little, if anything, to do with the high cost of living. When the cost of living is greater than his earning power, he and his family are threatened with an irreparable injury. Even if the damage to him is obvious and he could prove that the employer is making excess profits while he and his are hungry and cold, he cannot go into a court of law and ask relief.

Notwithstanding the progress we have made in many things, the strike is still the only legal method open to the workers by which they can compel a hearing. Until some machinery is devised that will make for industrial democracy, the strike will continue as labor's weapon. It is not because workingmen like the strike but because it is the only method they have.

The strike falls heaviest on the backs of the toilers.

They pay. Their families know its terrors. The strike is not even good sportsmanship, for the workers are not on even terms with the employers. When workingmen are locked out or when they strike, the hardships of it fall not only upon themselves. The brunt is borne by their children and wives. The employer seldom suffers hunger or cold, or does his family feel the pangs of the strike. With him it is almost always a financial loss at worst, only a matter of dollars and cents.

Strikes lead to lawlessness on both sides. The employer frequently hires criminal gunmen as strike-breakers; often idle hungry workingmen on strike have little regard for law and order. It is not that either employer or worker is at heart a law-breaker; the strike is war, and war knows no law.

Strikes develop class consciousness and in so doing injure national solidarity. They divide the house against itself. They leave scars when lost or won. Beaten men do not return to their shops with any spirit of coöperation. On the contrary, they return with revenge in their hearts and they wait for another day. One strike breeds another. When the workmen win, the employer takes them back with a resolve to get even and to prepare for the next tussle.

There are three parties to every strike and the third party, the public, always loses. Production is interrupted, the loss and waste must be paid for and the bill is always sent to the innocent victim, the public.

The present world unrest will not have been without its compensations if in making acute the strained rela-

tions between labor and capital it is responsible for the establishment of a new and better relation between the workers and the employers of the world. Even at this moment when the peak of unrest has not as yet been reached, there are many signs that we are heading in the direction of a permanent industrial peace. The preliminary statement of the President's Industrial Conference shows signs of an agreement among the three groups, representing the people, the workers, and the employers, on certain fundamentals which underlie the whole trouble. A few striking sentences from this statement measure the drift.

The true relationship between employer and employee in large industries can be promoted only by the deliberate organization of that relationship. Not only must the theory that labor is a commodity be abandoned but the concept of leadership must be substituted for that of mastership. New machinery of democratic representation must be erected to suit the conditions of present industry and restore a measure of personal contact and a sense of responsibility between employer and employee. The more recent development of such machinery with the coöperation of organized labor is a hopeful sign. HUMAN FELLOWSHIP IN INDUSTRY MAY BE EITHER AN EMPTY PHRASE OR A LIVING FACT. There is no magic formula. It can be a fact only if there is continued and sincere effort for mutual understanding and an unfailing recognition that there is a community of interest between employer and employee.

The sending to the scrap heap of the old "master and servant" idea is a good beginning. The recognition of labor as human rather than as a commodity marks the

end of the industrial day when labor was a chattel. No greater or more timely truth was ever penned than the statement that "human fellowship in industry may be either an empty phrase or a living fact." The way to industrial democracy is more democracy. One of the fundamental causes of industrial discontent has been the lack of the human, personal relationship between employer and employee. The strike and the lock-out have created a mental state which has made enemies of men whose common interest should have made them friends.

The workingmen's grievance is not merely a question of wages or hours of employment. It goes deeper. The workers want the joy and satisfaction of being part of the business. Hitherto they have been part of the business only in the sense that they have given it their lives. Work without an interest in the business is to the worker just what it would be to the employer, drudgery. Workingmen have the same human impulses and feelings that employers have. The monotony of being a worker without any interest in the job except to get the most salary possible for the least work makes real coöperation impossible, and the quality and quantity of production is affected.

Labor and capital should be a partnership. The two are like the blades of a scissors; separate and apart they are meaningless and valueless; joined together, functioning harmoniously, they are useful and necessary to the world. This partnership idea must be put into practice. The product of the partnership must be more fairly divided. There is no gainsaying that distribution has

been entirely in the hands of the employers and that the workers have suffered.

In Prague I asked President Mazayrik for his opinion of the cause of unrest. He replied:

Here we have a pile of gold and a few people in possession of it, wasting it to their own injury and to the detriment of the world, while over here we have the many living in wretchedness and fear.

I found an illustration in Paris. I had been looking at some famous paintings. The picture of a baby attracted me. It was of a child of the people. I was told it was worth \$100,000. Later in the day, walking through the streets of the poorer districts in Paris, I saw dozens of children, any of whom might have posed for the picture, and these children were worth nothing. The painting hung in a beautiful building. These children lived in hovels. The work of the Master seems to have lost its value.

There was a time when usury was not considered a social or legal crime. Money-lenders insisted they had the right to lend their money at any rate of interest they could obtain. They took advantage of the borrower's necessity and argued that it was their right to make such private contracts as they could. When saner minds urged that the state had an interest, that the public welfare was affected by the lender's exacting the last pound of flesh, a cry went up that the sacred right of private contract was being invaded; that the liberty of man's relation with man was being violated. Yet, the laws

against usury came and they have remained. These laws provide that a lender shall be limited in the amount he receives as interest on his loans. To-day every one admits the morality, the humanity, the wisdom and the justice of the usury laws.

Men investing money in business injure the public welfare when they profiteer. We call it robbing the consumer. How much greater the larceny when the excess profits come from the sweat of the producer?

Big business must be honestly organized. The capitalization of the corporation should represent values actually invested. The investors are entitled to a reasonable return on their investment, to an insurance against the "rainy day;" they are entitled to set aside a percentage of the earnings gradually to replace the capital invested. After this is done, the balance should go to the workers. Into the business they have put their lives; out of it they are entitled to get more than a living. Their lives are spent in their work. Surely they have a right to a say in their own lives.

No one with whom I have talked had the plans and specifications for the New Order, but many had in mind a general outline. The government, the working-men, the employers should coöperate in making the plan, in building the New World.

Two plans have been suggested. Both are worthy of the careful consideration of Congress. They have a common object, to prevent strikes not by prohibiting the strike but by doing away with the need of the strike by providing a peaceful method of settling the questions

that are bound to arise between employers and employees. These plans do not provide for compulsory arbitration. They avoid the pitfall of force and in its place invoke the power of public opinion to induce the arbitration of disputes and the acceptance of awards.

One proposal comes from the President's Second Industrial Conference. The general structure is thus outlined by the commission:

1. The parties to the dispute may voluntarily submit their differences for settlement to a board, known as a regional adjustment conference. This board consists of four representatives selected by the parties and four others in their industry chosen by them and familiar with their problems. The board is presided over by a trained government official, the regional chairman, who acts as a conciliator. If a unanimous agreement is reached, it results in a collective bargain having the same effect as if reached by joint organization in the shops.

2. If the regional conference fails to agree unanimously, the matter, with certain restrictions, goes, under the agreement of submission, to the national industrial board, unless the parties prefer the decision of an umpire selected by them.

3. The voluntary submission to a regional adjustment conference carries with it an agreement by both parties that there shall be no interference with production pending the processes of adjustment.

4. If the parties, or either of them, refuse voluntarily to submit the dispute to the processes of the plan of adjustment, a regional board of inquiry is formed by the regional chairman, of two employers and two employees from the industry, and not parties to the dispute. This board has the right, under proper safeguards, to subpoena witnesses

and records and the duty to publish its findings as a guide to public opinion. Either of the parties at conflict may join the board of inquiry on giving an undertaking that, so far as its side is concerned, it will agree to submit its contention to a regional adjustment conference, and if both join, a regional adjustment conference is automatically created.

5. The National Industrial Board in Washington has general oversight of the working of the plan.

6. The plan is applicable also to public utilities, but in such cases the government agency, having power to regulate the service, has two representatives in the adjustment conference. Provision is made for prompt report of its findings to the rate regulating body.

7. The plan provides machinery for prompt and fair adjustment of wages and working conditions of government employees. It is especially necessary for this class of employees, who should not be permitted to strike.

8. The plan involves no penalties other than those imposed by public opinion. It does not impose compulsory arbitration. It does not deny the right to strike. It does not submit to arbitration the policy of the "closed" or "open" shop.

The other proposal comes from Secretary of Labor Wilson:

OUTLINE OF PLAN FOR ADJUSTMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

There shall be created a Board of equal numbers of employers and employees in each of the principal industries and a Board to deal with miscellaneous industries not having separate boards. The representatives of labor on such boards shall be selected in such manner as the workmen in the industry may determine. The representatives of the

employers shall be selected in such manner as the employers in the industry may determine.

Whenever any dispute arises in any plant or series of plants that cannot be adjusted locally the question or questions in dispute shall be referred to the Board created for that industry for adjustment. The Board shall also take jurisdiction whenever in the judgment of one-half of its members a strike or lockout is imminent. Decisions of the Board on questions of wages, hours of labor, or working conditions must be arrived at by unanimous vote. If the Board shall fail to come to a unanimous determination of any such question, the question in dispute shall be referred to a General Board appointed by the President of the United States in the following manner:

One third of the number to be appointed in agreement with the organization or organizations of employers most representative of employers; one third of the number to be appointed in agreement with the organization or organizations of labor most representative of labor; one-third of the number to be appointed by the President direct.

Any question in dispute submitted to the General Board for adjudication shall be decided by the unanimous vote of the Board. If the General Board fails to arrive at a decision by unanimous vote the question or questions at issue shall be submitted to an umpire for determination. The umpire shall be selected by one of the two following processes: First, by unanimous selection of the General Board. Failing of such selection, then the umpire shall be drawn by lot from a standing list of twenty persons named by the President of the United States as competent umpires in labor disputes.

In all disputes that may be pending locally, or before the Industrial Board, or before the General Board, or before the umpire, the employers and employees shall each have the

right to select counsel of their own choice to represent them in presenting the matter in controversy.

Whenever an agreement is reached locally, or by the unanimous vote of the Industrial Board, or by the unanimous vote of the General Board, or by the decision of the umpire, the conclusion arrived at shall have all the force and effect of a trade agreement which employers and employees shall be morally bound to accept and abide by.

It is understood that this plan would not interfere with any system of joint wage conferences now in existence unless or until the failure to agree in such a conference made a strike or lockout imminent.

The man seeking justice must do justice; he who wants liberty must respect the rights of others; if there is to be freedom, order and security, all must submit to the will of the majority. This is the Golden Rule, the rock upon which free government is built. Lincoln voiced the creed:

Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the Charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political slogan of the nation.

Let respect for the law light the way in this day of unrest. If we do, we shall not stumble. We are facing East. The new day is breaking. A better understanding is in sight. Let no one stand in the way of com-

promise and concession. To avoid entangling alliances it is not necessary to abandon Europe. To put an end to war some open agreement of nations is necessary. Secret treaties must cease; the new internationalism must be a covenant insuring the democracy of the world. America's place is in the vanguard of the nations. We are a world power; we cannot escape our place and our responsibility in the family of nations.

"America for Americans, and all for humanity," might not make a bad foreign policy.

The creed of our house is: "Man is his brother's keeper."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE LABORING AND EXPLOITED PEOPLE¹

THE form of the following declaration is explained by the fact that it was prepared for submission to the Constituent Assembly, which, however, broke up without acting upon it.

The Central Executive Committee proclaims the following basic principles:

ARTICLE I

The Constituent Assembly resolves:

1. Russia is declared to be a Republic of Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers', Peasants' Deputies. All the power in the center and in the provinces belongs to these Soviets.
2. The Russian Soviet Republic is formed on the basis of a Free Union of Free Nations, as a Federation of National Soviet Republics.

¹The Declaration and Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic was submitted to the Constitutional Convention and because the Convention refused to adopt the Soviet Declaration it was dissolved by the "Red" Guard at the command of Lenin.

ARTICLE II

Taking as its fundamental task the abolition of any exploitation of men by men, the complete elimination of the division of society into classes, the ruthless suppression of exploiters, the establishment of a socialistic organization of society, and the victory of socialism in all countries, the Constituent Assembly resolves further:

1. To effect the socialization of the land, private ownership of land is abolished, and the whole land fund is declared common national property and transferred to the laborers without compensation, on the basis of equalized use of the soil. All forests, minerals, and waters of state-wide importance as well as the whole inventory of animate and inanimate objects, all estates and agricultural enterprises, are declared national property.

2. The Soviet law of labor control and the supreme board of National Economy are confirmed with the view of securing the authority of the toilers over the exploiters, as the first step to the complete transfer of all factories, mills, mines, railways and other means of production and transportation to the ownership of the Workmen's and Peasants' Soviet Republic.

3. The transfer of all banks to the ownership of the Workers' and Peasants' state is confirmed, this being one of the conditions of the emancipation of the laboring masses from the yoke of capital.

4. With a view to the destruction of the parasitic

classes of society and the organization of the national economy, universal labor service is established.

5. In the interest of securing all the power for the laboring masses and the elimination of any possibility of the reëstablishment of the power of the exploiters, the army of the toilers, the formation of a socialistic "Red" army of workmen and peasants, and the complete disarmament of the wealthy classes are decreed.

ARTICLE III

1. Expressing its inflexible determination to wrest humanity from the talons of financial capital and imperialism, which have drenched the earth with blood in this most criminal of wars, the Constituent Assembly subscribes unanimously to the policy of abrogating secret treaties which has been adopted by the Soviet government, the organization of the widest fraternalization with the workmen and peasants of the armies now warring against each other, and the securing, at any cost and by revolutionary means, of a democratic peace without annexations and indemnities, on the basis of free self-determination of peoples.

2. For these same purposes the Constituent Assembly insists upon a complete break with the barbarous policy of bourgeois civilization, which built the prosperity of the exploiters among the few chosen nations upon the enslavement of hundreds of millions of the laboring population in Asia, in the colonies in general, and in the small countries.

The Constituent Assembly welcomes the policy of the Council of People's Commissars, which has proclaimed the complete independence of Finland, which has begun the removal of the troops from Persia, and which has declared the freedom of self-determination for Armenia.

The Constituent Assembly views the Soviet law of the repudiation of the loans contracted by the Government of the Czar, by the land owners, and by the bourgeoisie, as the first blow to international banking, finance, and capital, and expresses its confidence that the Soviet authority will continue to pursue that course until the complete victory of rising international labor against the yoke of capital is attained.

ARTICLE IV.

Having been elected on the basis of party lists made up before the October revolution, when the people could not yet rise *en masse* against the exploiters and did not know the strength of the opposition when the latter defends its class privileges, and when the people had not yet practically undertaken the creation of a socialistic society, the Constituent Assembly would deem it radically wrong, even from a formal point of view, to set itself in opposition to the Soviets.

In substance the Constituent Assembly considers that now, at the moment of the decisive battle of the people with their exploiters, there can be no place for the latter in any of the organs of government. The power

must belong wholly and exclusively to the toiling masses and their plenipotentiaries, the Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates.

Supporting the Soviet Government and the Decrees of the Council of the People's Commissars, the Constituent Assembly recognizes that its tasks are completed when it has framed a general statement of the fundamental basis of a socialistic reconstruction of society.

At the same time, aiming at the creation of a really free and voluntary and consequently a more complete and lasting union of the laboring classes of all the nations of Russia, the Constituent Assembly confines itself to the establishment of the fundamental principles of federation of the Soviet Republic of Russia, leaving it to the Workmen and Peasants of each nation to decide independently at their own representative Soviet Congress, whether they wish to participate in the Federal Government and in the other Soviet Institutions, and on what basis.

ABOLITION OF CLASSES AND CIVIL RANK

1. All classes and class divisions of citizens, class privileges and disabilities, class organization and institutions which have until now existed in Russia, as well as all civil ranks, are abolished.
2. All designations (as merchant, nobleman, burgher, peasant, etc.), titles (as prince, count, etc.), and distinctions of civil ranks (privy, state, and other chancellors), are abolished, and one common designation is

established for all the population of Russia—citizen of the Russian Republic.

3. The properties of the noblemen's class institutions are hereby transferred to corresponding Zemstvo self-governing bodies.

4. The properties of the Merchants' and Burghers' Associations are hereby placed at the disposal of corresponding municipal bodies.

5. All class institutions, transactions, and archives are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of corresponding municipal Zemstvo bodies.

6. All corresponding clauses of the laws which have existed until now are abolished.

7. This decree becomes effective from the day of its publication and is to be immediately put into effect by the local Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

YA. SVERDLOV

President of the Central Executive Committee

VL. OULIANOV (LENIN)

President of the Council of People's Commissars

BONCH-BRUYEVICH

Director of the Affairs of the Council of People's

Commissars

N. GORBOUNOV

Secretary to the Council.

November 10, 1917.

APPENDIX II

A DECLARATION BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

WHEN, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, wherever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed,

will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world:

1. He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.
2. He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operations till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.
3. He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the Legislature—a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

4. He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the repository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

5. He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the people.

6. He has refused, for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected, whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the State remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the dangers of invasions from without, and convulsions within.

7. He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

8. He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

9. He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

10. He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

11. He has kept among us in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our Legislatures.

12. He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.
13. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitutions, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation;
14. For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us;
15. For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States;
16. For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;
17. For imposing taxes on us without our consent;
18. For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of a trial by jury;
19. For transporting us beyond seas, to be tried for pretended offenses;
20. For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies;
21. For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering, fundamentally, the forms of our governments;
22. For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

23. He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection, and waging war against us.

24. He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burned our towns and destroyed the lives of our people.

25. He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

26. He has constrained our fellow-citizens, taken captive on the high seas, to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

27. He has excited domestic insurrection among us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms; our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in our attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settle-

ment here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They, too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind—enemies in war; in peace, friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved, and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance of the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

APPENDIX III

CONSTITUTION (Fundamental Law)

The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic. Resolutions of the 5th All-Russian Congress of Soviets, adopted July 10, 1918.

THE declaration of rights of the laboring and exploited people (approved by the third All-Russian Congress of Soviets in January, 1918), together with the Constitution of the Soviet Republic, approved by the fifth Congress, constitutes a single fundamental law of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

This fundamental law becomes effective upon the publication of the same in its entirety in the "Izvestia of the All-Russian General Executive Committee." It must be published by all organs of the Soviet government and must be posted in a prominent place in every Soviet institution.

The fifth Congress instructs the People's Commissariat of Education to introduce in all schools and educational institutions of the Russian Republic the study and explanation of the basic principles of this Constitution.

ARTICLE ONE.**Declaration of Rights of the Laboring and Exploited People.**

Chapter One.

1. Russia is declared to be a Republic of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. All the central and local power belongs to these Soviets.
2. The Russian Soviet Republic is organized on the basis of a free union of free nations, as a federation of Soviet national Republics.

Chapter Two.

3. Bearing in mind as its fundamental problem the abolition of exploitation of men by men, the entire abolition of the division of the people into classes, the suppression of exploiters, the establishment of a Socialist society, and the victory of socialism in all lands, the third All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies further resolves:

- a. For the purpose of realizing the socialization of land, all private property in land is abolished, and the entire land is declared to be national property and is to be apportioned among husbandmen without any compensation to the former owners, in the measure of each one's ability to till it.

- b. All forests, treasures of the earth, and waters of general public utility, all implements whether animate or inanimate, model farms and agricultural enterprises are declared to be national property.

c. As a first step toward complete transfer of ownership to the Soviet Republic of all factories, mills, mines, railways and other means of production and transportation, the Soviet law for the control by workmen and the establishment of the Supreme Soviet of National Economy is hereby confirmed, so as to assure the power of the workers over the exploiters.

d. With reference to international banking and finance, the third Congress of Soviets is discussing the Soviet decree regarding the annulment of loans made by the Government of the Czar, by landowners and the bourgeoisie, and it trusts that the Soviet government will firmly follow this course until the final victory of the international workers' revolt against the oppression of capital.

e. The transfer of all banks into the ownership of the Workers' and Peasants' government, as one of the conditions of the liberation of the toiling masses from the yoke of capital, is confirmed.

f. Universal obligation to work is introduced for the purpose of eliminating the parasitic strata of society and organizing the economic life of the country.

g. For the purpose of securing the working classes in the possession of the complete power, and in order to eliminate all possibility of restoring the power of the exploiters, it is decreed that all toilers be armed, and that a Socialist "Red" Army be organized and the propertied class be disarmed.

Chapter Three.

4. Expressing its absolute resolve to liberate mankind from the grip of capital and imperialism, which flooded the earth with blood in this present most criminal of all wars, the third Congress of Soviets fully agrees with the Soviet government in its policy of breaking secret treaties, or organizing on a wide scale the fraternization of the workers and peasants of the belligerent armies, and of making all efforts to conclude a general democratic peace without annexations or indemnities, upon the basis of the free determination of the people.

5. It is also to this end that the third Congress of Soviets insists upon putting an end to the barbarous policy of the bourgeois civilization which enables the exploiters of a few chosen nations to enslave hundreds of millions of the toiling population of Asia, of the colonies and of small countries generally.

6. The third Congress of Soviets hails the policy of the Council of People's Commissars in proclaiming the full independence of Finland, in withdrawing troops from Persia, and in proclaiming the right of Armenia to self-determination.

Chapter Four.

7. The third All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies believes that now, during the progress of the decisive battle between the proletariat and its exploiters, the exploiters cannot

hold a position in any branch of the Soviet government. The power must belong entirely to the toiling masses and to their plenipotentiary representatives—the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

8. In its effort to create a league—free and voluntary, and for that reason all the more complete and secure—of the working classes of all the peoples of Russia, the third Congress of Soviets merely establishes the fundamental principles of the federation of Russian Soviet Republics, leaving to the workers and peasants of every people to decide the following question at their plenary sessions of their Soviets; whether or not they desire to participate, and on what basis, in the federal government and other federal Soviet institutions.

ARTICLE TWO.

General Provision of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

Chapter Five

9. The fundamental problem of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic involves, in view of the present transition period, the establishment of a dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat and the poorest peasantry in the form of a powerful All-Russian Soviet authority, for the purpose of abolishing the exploitation of men by men and of introducing Socialism, in which there will be neither a division into classes nor a state of autocracy.

10. The Russian Republic is a free Socialist society of all the working people of Russia. The entire power, within the boundaries of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, belongs to all the working people of Russia, united in urban and rural Soviets.

11. The Soviets of those regions which differentiate themselves by a special form of existence and national character may unite in autonomous regional unions, ruled by the local Congress of the Soviets and their executive organs.

These autonomous regional unions participate in the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic upon the basis of a federation.

12. The supreme power of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic belongs to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, and, to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

13. For the purpose of securing to the toilers real freedom of conscience, the church is to be separated from the state and the school from the church, and the right of religious and anti-religious propaganda is accorded to every citizen.

14. For the purpose of securing the freedom of expression to the toiling masses, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic abolishes all dependence of the press upon capital, and turns over to the working people and the poorest peasantry all technical and material means of publication of newspapers, pamphlets, books, etc., and guarantees their free circulation throughout the country.

15. For the purpose of enabling the workers to hold free meetings, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic offers to the working class and to the poorest peasantry furnished halls, and takes care of their heating and lighting appliances.

16. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, having crushed the economic and political power of the propertied classes and having thus abolished all obstacles which interfered with the freedom of organization and action of the workers and peasants, offers assistance, material and other, to the workers and the poorest peasantry in their effort to unite and organize.

17. For the purpose of guaranteeing to the workers real access to knowledge, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic sets itself the task of furnishing full and general free education to the workers and the poorest peasantry.

18. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic considers work the duty of every citizen of the Republic, and proclaims as its motto: "He shall not eat who does not work."

19. For the purpose of defending the victory of the great peasants' and workers' revolution, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic recognizes the duty of all citizens of the Republic to come to the defense of their Socialist Fatherland, and it, therefore, introduces universal military training. The honor of defending the revolution with arms is given only to the toilers, and the non-toiling elements are charged with the performance of other military duties.

20. In consequence of the solidarity of the toilers of all nations, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic grants all political rights of Russian citizens to foreigners who live in the territory of the Russian Republic and are engaged in toil and who belong to the toiling class. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic also recognizes the right of local Soviets to grant citizenship to such foreigners without complicated formality.

21. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, recognizing equal rights of all citizens, irrespective of their racial or national connections, proclaims all privileges on this ground, as well as oppression of national minorities, to be in contradiction with the fundamental laws of the Republic.

23. Being guided by the interests of the working class as a whole, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic deprives all individuals and groups of rights which could be utilized by them to the detriment of the Socialist Revolution.

ARTICLE THREE.

Construction of the Soviet Power.

A. Organization of the Central Power.

Chapter Six

The All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants', Cossacks' and Red Army Deputies.

24. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets is composed of representatives of urban Soviets (one delegate for

25,000 voters), and of representatives of the provincial (Gubernia) congresses of Soviets (one delegate for 125,000 inhabitants).

Note 1. In case the Provincial Congress is not called before the All-Russian Congress is convoked, delegates for the latter are sent directly from the country (Ouezd) Congress.

Note 2. In case the Regional (Oblast) Congress is convoked indirectly, previous to the convocation of the All-Russian Congress, delegates for the latter may be sent by the Regional Congress.

26. The All-Russian Congress is convoked by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee at least twice a year.

27. A special All-Russian Congress is convoked by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee upon its own initiative, or upon the request of local Soviets having not less than one third of the entire population of the Republic.

28. The All-Russian Congress elects an All-Russian Central Executive Committee of not more than 200 members.

29. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee is entirely responsible to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

30. In the periods between the convocation of the Congresses, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee is the supreme power of the Republic.

Chapter Seven

The All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

31. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee is the supreme legislative, executive, and controlling organ of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

32. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee directs in a general way the activity of the workers' and peasants' government and of all organs of the Soviet authority in the country, and it coördinates and regulates the operation of the Soviet Constitution and the resolutions of the All-Russian Congresses and of the central organs of the Soviet power.

33. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee considers and enacts all measures and proposals introduced by the Soviet of People's Commissars or by the various departments, and it also issues its own decrees and regulations.

34. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee convokes the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, at which time the Executive Committee reports on its activity and on general questions.

35. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee forms a Council of People's Commissars for the purpose of general management of the affairs of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, and it also forms departments (People's Commissariats) for the purpose of conducting various branches.

36. The members of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee work in the various departments (People's Commissariats) or execute special orders of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

Chapter Eight

The Council of People's Commissar.

37. The Council of People's Commissars is entrusted with the general management of the affairs of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

38. For the accomplishment of this task the Council of People's Commissars issues decrees, resolutions, orders, and, in general, takes all steps necessary for the proper and rapid conduct of government affairs.

39. The Council of People's Commissars notifies immediately the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of all its orders and resolutions.

40. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee has the right to revoke or suspend all orders and resolutions of the Council of People's Commissars.

41. All orders and resolutions of the Council of People's Commissars of great significance are turned over for considerational and final approval to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

Note: Measures requiring immediate execution may be enacted directly by the Council of People's Commissars.

42. The members of the Council of People's Commissars stand at the head of the various People's Commissariats.

43. There are seventeen People's Commissars:

- a. Foreign Affairs.
- b. Army.
- c. Navy.
- d. Interior.
- e. Justice.
- f. Labor.
- g. Social Welfare.
- h. Education.
- i. Post and Telegraph.
- j. National Affairs.
- k. Finances.
- l. Ways of Communication.
- m. Agriculture.
- n. Commerce and Industry.
- o. National Supplies.
- p. State Control.
- q. Supreme Soviet of National Economy.
- r. Public Health.

44. Every Commissar has a College (Committee) of which he is the President, and the members of which are appointed by the Council of People's Commissars.

45. A People's Commissar has the individual right to decide all questions under the jurisdiction of his Com-

missariat, and he is to report on his decision to the College. If the College does not agree with the Commissar on some decisions, the former may, without stopping the execution of the decision, complain of it to the executive members of the Council of People's Commissioners to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

Individual members of the College have this right also.

46. The Council of People's Commissars is entirely responsible to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

47. The People's Commissars and the Colleges of the People's Commissariats are entirely responsible to the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

48. The title of People's Commissar belongs only to members of the Council of People's Commissars, which is in charge of general affairs of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, and it cannot be used by any other representative of the Soviet power, either central or local.

Chapter Nine

Affairs in the Jurisdiction of the All-Russian Congress and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

49. The All-Russian Congress and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee deal with questions of state, such as:

a. Ratification and amendment of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

- b. General direction of the entire interior and foreign policy of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.
- c. Establishing and changing boundaries, also ceding territory belonging to the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.
- d. Establishing boundaries for regional Soviet unions belonging to the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, also settling disputes among them.
- e. Admission of new members to the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, and recognition of the secession of any part of it.
- f. The general administrative division of the territory of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic and the approval of regional unions.
- g. Establishing and changing of weights, measures and money denominations in the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.
- h. Foreign relations, declaration of war, and ratification of peace treaties.
- i. Making loans, signing commercial treaties, and financial agreements.
- j. Working out a basis and a general plan for the national economy and for various branches in the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.
- k. Approval of the budget of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.
- l. Levying taxes and establishing the duties of citizens to the state.

- m. Establishing the bases for the organization of armed forces.
- n. State legislation, judicial organization and procedure, civil and criminal legislation, etc.
- o. Appointment and dismissal of the individual People's Commissars or the entire Council; also approval of the President of the Council of People's Commissars.
- p. Granting and canceling Russian citizenship and fixing rights of foreigners.
- q. The right to declare individual and general amnesty.

50. Besides the above-mentioned questions, the All-Russian Congress of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee have charge of all other affairs which according to their decision, require their attention.

51. The following questions are solely under the jurisdiction of the All-Russian Congress:

- a. Ratification and amendment of the fundamental principles of the Soviet Constitution.
- b. Ratification of peace treaties.

52. The decision of questions indicated in Items c and h of Paragraph 49 may be made by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee only in case it is impossible to convoke the Congress.

Chapter Ten

B. Organization of the Local Soviets. The Congress of the Soviets.

53. Congresses of Soviets are composed as follows:

- a. Regional: Of representatives of the urban and

county Soviets, one representative for 25,000 inhabitants of the county, and one representative for 5,000 voters of the cities—but not more than 500 representatives for the entire region—or of representatives of the provisional Congresses, chosen on the same basis, if such a Congress meets before the regional Congress.

b. Provincial (Gubernia): Of representatives of urban and rural (Volost) Soviets, one representative for 10,000 inhabitants from the rural districts, and one representative for 2,000 voters in the city; altogether not more than 300 representatives for the entire province. In case the county Congress meets before the provincial, election takes place on the same basis, but by the county Congress instead of the rural.

c. County: Of representatives of rural Soviets, one delegate for each 1,000 inhabitants, but not more than 300 delegates for the entire county.

d. Rural: (Volost): Of representatives of all village Soviets in the Volost one delegate for ten members of the Soviet.

Note 1. Representatives of urban Soviets which have a population of not more than 10,000 persons participate in the county Congress; village Soviets of districts of less than 1,000 inhabitants unite for the purpose of electing delegates to the county Congress.

Note 2. Rural Soviets of less than ten members send one delegate to the rural (Volost) Congress.

54. Congresses of the Soviets are convoked by the respective Executive Committees upon their own initiative, or upon request of local Soviets comprising not less

than one third of the entire population of the given district. In any case they are convoked at least twice a year for regions, every three months for provinces and counties, and once a month for rural districts.

55. Every Congress of Soviets (regional, provincial, county and rural) elects its Executive organ—an Executive Committee the membership of which shall not exceed:

(a) For regions and provinces, 25; (b) for a county, 20; (c) for a rural district, 10. The Executive Committee is responsible to the congress which elected it.

56. In the boundaries of the respective territories the Congress is the supreme power; during intervals between the convocations of the Congress, the executive Committee is the supreme power.

Chapter Eleven.

The Soviets of Deputies.

57. Soviets of Deputies are formed:

a. In cities, one deputy for each 1,000 inhabitants; the total to be not less than 50 and not more than 1,000 members.

b. All other settlements (towns, villages, hamlets, etc.) of less than 10,000 inhabitants, one deputy for each 100 inhabitants; the total to be not less than 3 and not more than 50 deputies for each settlement.

Term of the deputy, three months.

Note: In small rural sections, whenever possible, all questions shall be decided at general meetings of voters.

58. The Soviets of Deputies elects an Executive Committee to deal with current affairs; not more than 5 members for rural districts, one for every 50 members of the Soviets of cities, but not more than 15 and not less than 3 in the aggregate (Petrograd and Moscow not more than 40). The Executive Committee is entirely responsible to the Soviet which elected it.

59. The Soviet of Deputies is convoked by the Executive Committee upon its own initiative, or upon the request of not less than one half of the membership of the Soviet; in any case at least once a week in cities, and twice a week in rural sections.

60. Within its jurisdiction the Soviet, and the cases mentioned in Paragraph 57. Note, the meeting of the voters, is the supreme power in the given district.

Chapter Twelve.

Jurisdiction of the Local Organs of the Soviets.

61. Regional, provincial, county, and rural organs of the Soviet power and also the Soviets of Deputies have to perform the following duties:

- a. Carry out all orders of the respective higher organs of the Soviet power.
- b. Take all steps towards raising the cultural and economic standards of the given territory.
- c. Decide all questions of local importance within their respective territory.
- d. Coördinate all Soviet activity in their respective territory.

62. The Congresses of Soviets and their Executive Committees have the right to control the activity of the local Soviets (i. e., the regional Congress controls all Soviets of the respective regions; the provincial of the respective province, with the exception of the urban Soviets, etc.); and the regional and provincial Congresses and their Executive Committees in addition have the right to overrule the decisions of the Soviets of their districts, giving notice in important cases to the central Soviet authority.

63. For the purpose of performing their duties, the local Soviets, rural and urban, and the Executive Committees form sections respectively.

ARTICLE FOUR.

The Right to Vote.

Chapter Thirteen.

64. The right to vote and to be elected to the Soviets is enjoyed by the following citizens, irrespective of religion, nationality, domicile, etc., of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, of both sexes, who shall have completed their eighteenth year by the day of election:

a. All who have acquired the means of living through labor that is productive and useful to society, and also persons engaged in housekeeping, which enables the former to do productive work, i. e., laborers and employees of all classes who are employed in industry, trade, agriculture, etc., and peasants and Cossacks, agri-

cultural laborers who employ no help for the purpose of making profits.

b. Soldiers of the army and navy of the Soviets.

c. Citizens of the two preceding categories who have to any degree lost their capacity to work.

Note 1: Local Soviets may, upon approval of the central power, lower the age standard mentioned herein.

Note 2: Non-citizens mentioned in Paragraph 20 (Article Two, Chapter Five) have the right to vote.

65. The following persons enjoy neither the right to vote nor the right to be voted for, even though they belong to one of the categories enumerated above, namely:

a. Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase in profits.

b. Persons who have an income without doing any work, such as interest from capital, receipts from property, etc.

c. Private merchants, trade and commercial brokers.

d. Monks of clergy of all denominations.

e. Employees and agents of the former police, the gendarmerie corps, and the Okhrana (Czar's secret service), also members of the former reigning dynasty.

f. Persons who have in legal form been declared demented or mentally deficient, and also persons under guardianship.

g. Persons who have been deprived by a Soviet of their rights of citizenship because of selfish or dishonorable offenses, for the period fixed by the sentence.

Chapter Fourteen.

Elections.

66. Elections are conducted according to custom on days fixed by the local Soviets.

67. Election takes place in the presence of an electing committee and the representative of the local Soviet.

68. In case the representative of the Soviet cannot be present for valid causes, the chairman of the electing committee takes his place, and in case the latter is absent, the chairman of the election meeting replaces him.

69. Minutes of the proceedings and results of elections are to be compiled and signed by the members of the electing committee and the representative of the Soviet.

70. Detailed instructions regarding the election proceedings and the participation in them of professional and other workers' organizations are to be issued by the local Soviets, according to the instructions of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

Chapter Fifteen.

The Checking and Cancellation of Elections and Recall of the Deputies.

71. The respective Soviets receive all the records of the proceedings of the election.

72. The Soviet appoints a commission to verify the elections.

73. This commission reports on the results to the Soviets.

74. The Soviet decides the question when there is doubt as to which candidate is elected.

75. The Soviet announces a new election if the election of one candidate or another cannot be determined.

76. If an election was irregularly carried on in its entirety, it may be declared void by a higher Soviet authority.

77. The highest authority in relation to questions of elections is the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

78. Voters who have sent a deputy to the Soviet have the right to recall him, and to have a new election according to general provision.

ARTICLE FIVE.

The Budget.

79. The financial policy of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic in the present transition period of dictatorship of the proletariat, facilitates the fundamental purpose of expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the preparation of conditions necessary for the equality of all citizens of Russia in the production and distribution of wealth. To this end it sets forth as its task the supplying of the organs of the Soviet power with all necessary funds for local and state needs of the Soviet Republic, without regard to private property rights.

80. The state expenditures and income of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic are combined in the state budget.

81. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets or the All-

Russian Central Executive Committee determines what matters of income and taxation shall go to the state budget and what shall go to the local Soviets; they also set the limits of taxes.

82. The Soviets levy taxes only for the local needs. The state needs are covered by the funds of the state treasury.

83. No expenditure out of the state treasury not set forth in the budget of income and expense shall be made without a special order of the central power.

84. The local Soviets shall receive credits from the proper People's Commissars out of the state treasury, for the purpose of making expenditures for general state needs.

85. All credits allotted to the Soviets from the state treasury, and also credits approved for local needs, must be expended according to the estimates, and cannot be used for any other purposes without a special order of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Soviet of People's Commissars.

86. Local Soviets draw up semiannual and annual estimates of income and expenditure for local needs. The estimates of urban and rural Soviets participating in county congresses, and also the estimates of the county organs of the Soviet power, are to be approved by provincial and regional congresses or by their executive committees; the estimates of the urban, provincial, and regional organs of the Soviets are to be approved by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars.

87. The Soviets may ask for additional credits from the respective People's Commissariats for expenditures not set forth in the estimate, or where the allotted sum is insufficient.

88. In case of an insufficiency of local funds for local needs, the necessary subsidy may be obtained from the state treasury by applying to the All-Russian Central Executive or the Council of People's Commissars.

ARTICLE SIX.

The Coat of Arms and Flag of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

Chapter Seventeen

89. The coat of arms of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic consists of a red background on which a golden scythe and a hammer are placed (cross-wise, handles downward) in sun-rays and surrounded by a wreath, inscribed:

Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic
Workers of the World, Unite!

90. The commercial, naval, and army flag of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic consists of a red cloth, in the left hand corner of which (on top, near the pole) there are in golden characters the letters R. S. F. S. R., on the inscription: Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

Chairman of the fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee—J. Severdloff.

Executive Officers—All-Russian Central Executive Committee: T. I. Teedorowitch, F. A. Rosin, A. P. Rosenholz, A. C. Mitrofanoff, K. C. Maxinoff.

Secretary of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee—V. A. Avanessoff.

APPENDIX IV

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WE THE PEOPLE of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

ARTICLE I.—(Section 1.) 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

(Section 2.) 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

2. No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty-five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

3. Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five and Georgia three.

4. When Vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

5. The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

(Section 3.) 1. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

2. Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the Second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year; so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.

3. No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

4. The Vice-President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

5. The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

6. The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

7. Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust, or Profit under the United States; but the Party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

(Section 4.) 1. The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

(Section 5.) 1. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business: but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

2. Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

3. Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy;

and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

4. Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

(Section 6.) 1. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

2. No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

(Section 7.) 1. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

2. Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes

a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by Yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sunday excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

3. Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment), shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

(Section 8.) 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to

pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

2. To borrow Money on credit of the United States;
3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
4. To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;
5. To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;
6. To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;
7. To establish Post-Offices and post Roads;
8. To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;
9. To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;
10. To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;
11. To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;
12. To raise and support Armies, but no Appropri-

tion of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

13. To provide and maintain a Navy;
14. To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
15. To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrection and repel Invasions;
16. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;
17. To exercise exclusive legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And
18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

(Section 9.) 1. The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall

think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

2. The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

3. No Bill of Attainder, or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

4. No Capitation or other direct Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

5. No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

6. No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another; nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties, in another.

7. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

8. No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

(Section 10.) 1. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any title of Nobility.

2. No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws; and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

3. No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops or Ships of War, in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or Engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

ARTICLE II.—(Section 1.) 1. The Executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the Term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same Term, be elected as follows:

2. Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress;

but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

3. The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such a Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately chuse, by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List, the said House shall in like manner chuse the President. But in chusing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one vote; A quorum for this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President.

But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall chuse from them by Ballot the Vice-President.

4. The Congress may determine the Time of chusing the Electors, and the day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

5. No Person except a natural-born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

6. In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation, or Inability both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

7. The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be Increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period, any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

8. Before he enter on the Execution of his Office he

shall take the following Oath or Affirmation :—“I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

(Section 2.) 1. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States ; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the Executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

2. He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur ; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other Public Ministers, and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law ; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

3. The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate,

by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of the next Session.

(Section 3.) 1. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other Public Ministers; he shall take care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the Officers of the United States.

(Section 4.) 1. The President, Vice President, and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

ARTICLE III.—(Section 1.) 1. The judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may, from time to time, ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

(Section 2.) 1. The Judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties

made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens, or Subjects.

2. In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

3. The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

(Section 3.) 1. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

2. The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attained.

ARTICLE IV.—(Section 1.) 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and Judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the manner in which such Acts, Records, and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

(Section 2.) 1. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

2. A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

3. No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due.

(Section 3.) 1. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two

or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

(Section 4.) 1. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

ARTICLE V. 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and

that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ARTICLE VI. 1. All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

2. This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

3. The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

ARTICLE VII. 1. The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty-seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth. In Witness whereof

We have hereunto subscribed our Names, Geo. WASHINGTON—Presidt. and Deputy from Virginia.

Attest: WILLIAM JACKSON, Secretary.

New Hampshire:

John Langdon
Nicholas Gilman

Massachusetts:

Nathaniel Gorham
Rufus King

Connecticut:

Wm. Saml. Johnson
Roger Sherman

New York:

Alexander Hamilton

New Jersey:

Wil. Livingston
David Brearley
Wm. Paterson
Jona. Dayton

Pennsylvania:

B. Franklin
Thomas Mifflin
Robt. Morris
Geo. Clymer

Thos. Fitz Simons

Jared Ingersoll
James Wilson
Gouv. Morris

Delaware:

Geo. Read
Gunning Bedford Jun
John Dickinson
Richard Bassett
Jaco. Broom

Maryland:

James McHenry
Dan of St. Thos. Jenifer
Danl. Carroll

Virginia:

John Blair
James Madison Jr.

North Carolina:

Wm. Blount
Richd. Dobbs Spaight
Hu. Williamson

South Carolina:

J. Rutledge
Charles Pinckney
Charles Cotesworth
Pinckney

Pierce Butler.

Georgia:

William Few
Abr. Baldwin

[*Articles in Addition to and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, Proposed by Congress and Ratified by the Legislatures of the several States, Pursuant to the Fifth Article of the Constitution.]*

ARTICLE I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

ARTICLE II. A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

ARTICLE III. No Soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor, in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

ARTICLE IV. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

ARTICLE V. No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public

danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any Criminal Case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

ARTICLE VI. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining Witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of Counsel for his defence.

ARTICLE VII. In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

ARTICLE VIII. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

ARTICLE IX. The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

ARTICLE X. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the

States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

ARTICLE XI. The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or subjects of any Foreign State.

ARTICLE XII.—(Section I.) The Electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest number not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be

taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President. The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

ARTICLE XIII.—(Section 7.) Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

(Section 2.) Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

ARTICLE XIV.—(Section 1.) All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the juris-

diction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

(Section 2.) Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

(Section 3.) No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any

State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

(Section 4.) The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

(Section 5.) The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

ARTICLE XV.—(Section 1.) The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

(Section 2.) The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

ARTICLE XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration.

ARTICLE XVII.—(Section 1.) The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from

each state, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each senator shall have one vote. The electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature.

(Section 2.) When vacancies happen in the representation of any state in the Senate, the executive authority of such state shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any state may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

(Section 3.) This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

ARTICLE XVIII.—(Section 1.) After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

(Section 2.) The Congress and the several states shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

(Section 3.) This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several states as provided in the Constitution within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the states by the Congress.

No.8396.....

United States of America



DEPARTMENT OF STATE

I to whom these presents shall come, Greeting:

Certify That the document attached hereto is a
true translation of the Platform of the
Communist International as it appears
in the *Workers* of March 6, 1919, a
copy of which is on file in this
Department



In testimony whereof I, *Frank J. Polk*,
Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the Seal of the Department
of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Chief
Clerk of the said Department, at the City of Washington,
this 2 day of March, 1919

Frank J. Polk
Secretary of State.
By *Paul Davis*
Chief Clerk.

APPENDIX V

PLATFORM OF COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The contradictions of the capitalistic world system, which were concealed in its interior showed themselves with enormous force in one gigantic explosion—in the great imperialistic World War.

Capitalism attempted to overcome its own anarchy by organizing production. In the place of numerous competing enterprises were organized powerful unions of capitalists (syndicates, artels, and trusts). Bank capital united with industrial capital; all economic life came under the authority of this financial capitalistic oligarchy, which on the basis of this power and through its own organization attained an all-inclusive domination. In the place of free competition developed monopoly. The individual capitalist became a capitalist-member of a capitalistic union. Senseless anarchy came to be replaced by organization.

But in the same measure as the anarchy of the capitalistic method of production came to be replaced by capitalistic organization in individual countries, contradictions became sharper and sharper, as well as the struggle of competition, the anarchy of world economics.

¹ *Izvestia*, March 6, 1919.

The struggle between the greatest organized predatory states inevitably led to the monstrous imperialistic World War. The appetite for profits drove world capital to struggle for new markets, for new spheres for its capital, for new sources of raw material and for the cheap labor of colonial slaves. The imperialistic states which divide the whole world among themselves, which converted many millions of African, Asian, Australian, and American proletarians and peasants into mere working cattle, were obliged sooner or later to reveal, in this gigantic conflict, the actual anarchical character of capital. Thus came the greatest of crimes—the predatory World War.

Capitalism tried to overcome its own social structure so full of contradictions. Bourgeois society is a class society. But capital of the great “civilized” countries wished to suppress social contradictions. At the expense of colonial peoples they had robbed, capital bribed its own hired slaves and tried to create a community of interests between the exploiters and the exploited, the interests that were directed against the oppressed colonies, the colonial peoples, yellow, black, and red. It en-chained the European and American working class to the imperialistic “fatherland.”

But this same method of constant bribing, by which one tries to develop the patriotism of the working class and its spiritual enslavement, as a result of the war was converted into its very opposite. Physical exhaustion, the complete enslavement of the proletariat-monstrous oppression, impoverishment and degradation, world-hunger—these were the last prices that had to be paid

for civil peace. It (civil peace) was broken. The imperialistic war was changed to civil war.

The new epoch has been born. It is the epoch of the dissolution of capitalism, of its internal disintegration. It is the epoch of the communist revolution of the proletariat.

The imperialist system is collapsing. Ferment in the colonies, ferment among the small nationalities, till now not independent, the uprising of the proletariat, victorious proletarian revolution in several countries, the disintegration of imperialistic armies, the complete inability of the ruling class to direct further the destiny of the people—this is the picture of the present situation in the whole world.

Humanity, whose culture has been subject to disintegration, is now threatened by the danger of complete destruction. There is only one force capable of saving it and this force is the proletariat. There is no longer left the old capitalist “order,” and it can no longer exist. The final result of the existence of the capitalistic system of production is chaos, and this chaos can be overcome only by that large producing class—the working class. The latter must establish actual order—a communistic order. It must destroy the rule of capital, make wars impossible, wipe out frontiers between states, remake the whole world into a community which is working for itself, realize freedom and the brotherhood of peoples.

In the meanwhile, world capital is preparing for the last battle. Under the cover of the “League of Nations”

and of pacifistic chattering it is putting forth its last efforts to cement together the parts of the capitalistic system that are falling apart and it will use all its force against proletarian revolution that is beginning to flame up in such a way that it cannot be restrained.

To this new, grandiose conspiracy of the imperialistic classes the proletariat must answer by acquiring political power, by directing this power against its own enemy and using it as a lever for the economic reorganization of society. The final victory of the world proletariat will mean the beginning of the real history of liberated mankind.

CONQUEST OF POLITICAL POWER

The conquest of political power by the proletariat means the destruction of the political power of the bourgeoisie. The most powerful weapon of authority in the hands of the bourgeoisie is the bourgeois apparatus of state, with its capitalistic army which is under the command of bourgeoisie—junker officers, with its police and secret police, its prison-wardens and judges, its preachers, civil officials and such. The conquest of political power cannot be limited simply to a change in the personnel of the government departments, but must mean the destruction of this parasitic state apparatus, and the concentration in one's hand of a real force, the disarming of the bourgeoisie, of counter-revolutionary officers and of the white-guard and the arming of the proletariat, of the revolutionary soldiers and of the red-guards of

workmen; the removal of all bourgeois judges and the organization of a proletarian court of law; the destruction of the domination of reactionary officials and the establishment of new proletarian organs of government.

The victory of the proletariat is guaranteed by the disorganizing of hostile authority, and it must mean the destruction of the bourgeoisie, and the building up of the proletarian, apparatus of state. Only after the proletariat shall have triumphed by definitely breaking the opposition of the bourgeoisie will the proletariat be able in a useful manner to force its former opponents to serve it, gradually bringing them, under its own control, to the work of communistic construction.

DEMOCRACY AND LEADERSHIP

Just as every state so the proletarian state represents an apparatus of compulsion, and this apparatus of compulsion is now directed against the enemy of the working class. Its significance consists in this, that it is to break and make impossible the resistance of the exploiters, who will use in this struggle all means to suppress the revolution in streams of blood. On the other hand, the dictatorship of the proletariat which will place this class officially in a position of the dominant class in society, represents a transition state. In measure as the opposition of the bourgeoisie is broken, the latter will be expropriated and gradually converted into a working class of society, and the dictatorship will disappear, and the state and the dividing of society into classes will die out.

So-called democracy, that is, bourgeois democracy, is nothing other than a concealed dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The famous general "will of the people" is the same kind of fiction as is the united people. In fact there exist classes with opposed tendencies exclusive of one another. And as the bourgeoisie is an insignificant minority, so it uses the fiction, this fictitious popular will, in order, under the cover of this broad phrase, to strengthen its domination over the working class and impose on the latter the will of its own class. On the other hand, the proletariat, which represents the overwhelming majority of the population, will quite openly use the class strength of its mass organizations, of its Soviets, in order to abolish the privileges of the bourgeoisie, and guarantee the passing to a non-class communistic society.

The essence of bourgeois democracy consists in a purely declaratory formal recognition of rights and liberties that are not accessible for the proletariat and the half-proletarian elements because the latter have not the material means, while the bourgeoisie has the full possibility to use its material means, its press, and its organizations for lies and to deceive the people. On the other hand, the essence of the Soviet system, of this new type of governmental authority, consists in this that under this system the proletariat is given the possibility in fact to secure for itself its rights and liberty. The Soviet authority will give to the people the best palaces, houses, printing shops, stores of paper, etc., for its press,

for its meetings, and its clubs. Only then will the proletarian democracy be really possible.

Bourgeois democracy with its parliamentary system allows to the masses participation in the government of the state only in words. In actual fact the masses and their organizations are completely shut off from actual authority and the actual government of the country. Under the system of Soviets mass organizations govern, and, through the latter, the masses themselves, since the Soviets bring a constantly increasing number of workmen into the administration of the state, and only thus is the entire working people gradually drawn into the actual work of governing the state. The Soviet system thus rests on mass organization of the proletariat in the form of these Soviets of revolutionary trade unions, co-operative societies, etc.

Bourgeois democracy and the parliamentary system, as a result of the separation of executive and legislative authority and the absence of the right to recall representatives, make broader the gulf between the masses and the state. On the other hand, the Soviet system, with its right of recall, by uniting the executive and legislative powers, and as a result of the ability of the Soviet to be functioning collegiate institutions, establishes a close bond between the masses and the organs of government. This bond is more easily maintained because under the system of Soviets, elections take place not according to artificially created districts but correspond with groupings resulting from the productive process.

Thus the Soviet system guarantees the possibility of

an actual proletarian democracy, a democracy for the proletariat, and within the proletariat, and a democracy directed against the bourgeoisie. Under this system the industrial proletariat is guaranteed a privileged position as the leading, better organized and politically more matured class, under the hegemony of which the half-proletarian elements and the peasant-poor elements of the village will be able gradually to raise themselves. These temporary privileges of the industrial proletariat must be used in order to wrest the non-propertied petty bourgeois masses of the village from under the influence of the village peasant bourgeoisie, to organize them and bring them as collaborators into the work of communistic construction.

THE EXPROPRIATION OF THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF PRODUCTION

The disintegration of the capitalistic system and of capitalistic labor discipline makes it impossible under the present inter-class relations to reestablish production on the former basis. The struggle of workmen for increase of wages, even when successful, does not lead to the expected raising of the standard of living because the increase of prices on all productions of consumption inevitably neutralizes the success. The energetic struggle of the workmen for increase of wages in those countries where the situation is clearly hopeless, because of the elemental bitterness and the tendency to convert the strike into a world strike, makes impossible the further

development of capitalistic production. Improvement of conditions of workmen can be attained only when the bourgeoisie (has been expropriated—this added by translator as there is evidently an omission here) and the proletariat itself takes possession of production. In order to raise the productive power of economic life, in order to break as quickly as possible the resistance of the bourgeoisie which is prolonging the agony of the old form of society and thus creating the danger of the complete disruption of economic life, the proletarian dictatorship must carry out the expropriation of the large bourgeoisie and nobility, and make the means of production and transportation the public property of the proletarian state.

Communism is being born now in the ruins of the capitalistic order; history will not give mankind any other issue from the situation. The opportunists who put forward the Utopian demands for the regeneration of the capitalistic system of economy in order to postpone socialization, are simply dragging out the solution of the crisis and thus creating the direct menace of complete ruin while the communistic revolution is the best and actually possible means by which the actual productive force in society—the proletariat—and with it society itself, may save themselves.

Proletarian dictatorship does not contemplate any kind of dividing up of the means of production and transportation. Quite the contrary, its task is to bring about a greater centralization of productive forces and the subjection of all production to a unified plan.

As the first steps on the road to the socialization of the entire economic life the following are necessary: The socialization of the apparatus of the largest banks, which now control industry; the gaining possession of all economic state-capitalistic organs by transferring them to the proletarian state governmental authority; the gaining possession of all commercial enterprises; the socialization of syndicalized and "trusted" branches of industry and also of those branches of industry in which the degree of concentration and centralization of capital are such as to make socialization technically possible; the socialization of agricultural farms and their conversion into publicly managed agricultural enterprises.

As for the small enterprises the proletariat must gradually unite them taking into consideration their sizes.

In this connection one must emphasize particularly that the small holders of private property may not be expropriated and the small proprietor who did not exploit the labors of others may not be subjected to any violent measures. This group will be drawn into the sphere of socialist organization gradually, by example and by practical experience, which will show the advantages of the new order, which in turn will free the small farmer and the small bourgeoisie from the economic yoke of the rich farmer and nobility and from the weight of taxes (particularly as the result of the repudiation of state loans), etc.

The task of the proletarian dictatorship in the fields of economics may be fulfilled only to the extent to which the proletariat will be able to create centralized organs

for the administration of industry and to realize workmen's administration. Furthermore, the proletariat will be obliged to use those of its mass organizations which are most closely associated with the process of production.

In the field of distribution, the proletarian dictatorship must bring about the proper distribution of products as a substitute for trading; one must call attention to those measures which will have to be adopted to this end: The socialization of the largest trading enterprises; the transfer into the hands of the proletariat of all bourgeois-public, and also municipal, organs of distribution; control over the largest coöperative combinations, the organization of which will still have enormous economic significance through the period of transition; the gradual centralization of all these organs and their gradual conversion into a single whole for the national distribution of products.

Both in the field of production and also in that of distribution all workers of qualified economic experience and specialization must be made use of, after their opposition in the field of politics will have been broken, so that they will be in a position to serve the new system of production, instead of capital.

The proletariat has no intention to oppress the latter (technical experts and specialists); quite the contrary, the proletariat will be the first to give to them the possibility of developing the most energetic creative activity. The proletarian dictatorship will replace the division into physical and intellectual labor, which is characteristic of

capitalism, by a uniting of the two and thus it will bring together labor and science.

Together with the expropriation of factories, mines, landed estate, etc., the proletariat must also put an end to the exploitation of the population by capitalistic house-owners, and transfer the larger houses into the hands of local workmen's Soviets, and move the workmen into the apartments of the bourgeoisie, etc. In the course of this enormous change, the Soviet authority must, on the one hand, create an enormous apparatus of administration, becoming more and more centralized, and, on the other hand, it must bring larger groups of the working people to the immediate task of government.

THE ROAD TO VICTORY

The revolutionary epoch demands of the proletariat the application of such methods of struggle as will concentrate all its energies, first of all methods of mass struggle with its logical conclusions—direct conflict in open battle with the bourgeoisie, governmental machinery. To this end must be subordinated all other means, as, for example, the revolutionary making use of bourgeois parliamentary institutions.

A necessary preliminary condition for such a victorious struggle is a rupture not only with the out-and-out lackeys of capital and with the executioners of the communist revolution, such as the right Social Democrats, but also a breaking away from the Center (followers of Kautsky) which abandons the proletariat at a critical moment and flirts with its open enemies.

On the other hand, one must form an alliance with the elements of the revolutionary workmen's movement, which, in spite of the fact that formerly they did not belong to the Socialist Party, have now become, in general and on the whole, supporters of the proletarian dictatorship in the form of Soviets, as for example certain elements of syndicalism.

The growth of the revolutionary movement in all countries, the danger that this revolution will be suppressed by a union of capitalistic states, attempts of traitor-socialist parties to unite (the forming of a yellow international in Berne), in order lackey-like to serve Wilson's league, and finally the absolute necessity of coördinating the proletarian movement—all this leads eventually to the establishment of a genuinely revolutionary and genuinely proletarian Communist International.

The International that will be able to subordinate so-called national interests to the interest of the world revolution, will, by this very reason, realize mutual assistance between proletariats of various countries, for without economic and other forms of mutual support the proletariat will not be able to establish the new society. On the other hand, in opposition to the yellow socialist International, the International of the communist proletariat will support the exploited peoples of colonies in their struggle against imperialism in order to assist the final collapse of the system of world imperialism.

The criminals of capitalism affirmed at the beginning of the World War that all of them were simply defending their own countries. But soon German imperialism

revealed its beast-like nature by a series of bloody acts in Russia, the Ukraine and Finland. Now, in their turn, the powers of the Entente are revealing themselves in the eyes even of the most retrograde groups of the population, for they have turned out to be the world-robbers and the murderers of the proletariat. In agreement with the German bourgeoisie and with socialist-patriots, with hypocritical phrases about peace on their lips, they are trying to crush to the ground, with the help of tanks and uneducated barbarian colonial troops, the revolution of the European proletariat. The white terror of the bourgeois cannibals is cruel beyond description. The sacrifices of the working class cannot be numbered; it has lost its best fighters, Liebknecht and Luxemburg.

The proletariat must defend itself at any cost. The Communist International calls on the entire proletariat of the world to take part in this last struggle. Arms against arms! Force against force!

Down with the imperialistic conspiracy of capital! Long live the international republic of proletarian Soviets.

APPENDIX VI

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL¹

Seventy-two years ago the Communist Party proclaimed its program to the world in the form of the Manifesto written by the greatest teachers of the proletarian revolution, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Even at that early time when Communism had scarcely come into the arena of conflict, it was hounded by the lies, hatred, and calumny of the possessing classes, who rightly suspected in it their mortal enemy. During these seven decades Communism has traveled a hard road of ascent followed by periods of sharp decline; successes but also severe defeats. In spite of all, the development at bottom went the way forecast by the Manifesto of the Communist Party. The epoch of the last decisive struggle came later than the apostles of the social revolution expected and wished. But it has come.

We Communists, representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of the different countries of Europe, America, and Asia, assembled in Soviet Moscow, feel and consider ourselves followers and fulfillers of the cause, the program of which was proclaimed seventy-two years ago. It is our task now to sum up the practical revolutionary experience of the working class, to cleanse the movement

¹ *Severnya Kommuna*, March 8, 1919.

No. 8395....

United States of America



DEPARTMENT OF STATE

To whom these presents shall come, Greeting:

Certify That document attached hereto is a true translation of the Manifesto of the Communist International as it appears in the newspaper Kommunika of March 8, 1919, a copy of which is on file in this department



In testimony whereof, Frank L. Polk,
Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the Seal of the Department
of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Chief
Clerk of the said Department, at the City of Washington,
this 2nd day of March, 1919.

Frank L. Polk
Secretary of State.
By Paul J. Davis
Chief Clerk.

of its treacherous admixtures of opportunism and socialist patriotism and to unite the efforts of all revolutionary parties of the world proletariat and thus facilitate and hasten the victory of the communist revolution in the whole world. Now when Europe is covered with ruins and piles of smoking wreckage, the greatest instigators are occupied with searchers for those guilty of the war. In their trail follow their servants: professors, members of parliaments, journalists, socialists-patriots and the other political *souteneurs* of the bourgeoisie.

For a long span of years Socialism predicted the inevitableness of the imperialistic war; it perceived the essential cause of this war in the insatiable greed of the possessing classes in both camps of capitalist nations. Two years before the outbreak of the war the responsible socialist leaders of all countries, at the Basle Congress, exposed imperialism as the instigator of the coming war and menaced the bourgeoisie with the threat to bring down on its head a socialist revolution, as the retaliation of the proletariat for the crimes of militarism. Now after the experience of five years, after history has exposed the predatory appetites of Germany and the no less criminal acts of the Allies, the State Socialists of the countries of the Entente together with their Governments continue to try to unmask as the instigator of the war the overthrown German Kaiser. Further, the German Socialist-patriots who in August, 1914, proclaimed the diplomatic white book of the Hohenzollern as the holiest gospel of the people, now, following the lead of the socialists of the Entente, with vulgar servility accuse the

overthrown Germany Monarchy, which they served so slavishly, as the main instigator of the war. In that way they hope to force people to forget their own rôle and at the same time gain the good will of the victors. But alongside the rôle of the overthrown dynasties of the Romanoffs, Hohenzollerns, and Hapsburgs, the capitalistic cliques of these countries and the rôle of the governing classes of France, England, Italy, and the United States, stand revealed in all their immeasurable criminalities in the light of the unfolding events and of diplomatic disclosures.

English diplomacy to the very outbreak of the war did not remove its secret visor. The Government of the "City" was afraid that if it categorically declared its participation in the war on the side of the Entente, the government of Berlin would recede and there would not be war. In London they wanted the war. Therefore they behaved in such a manner that in Berlin and Vienna they counted on the neutrality of England, while in Paris and St. Petersburg they evidently counted on her coming in.

The War which was prepared by the course of development during decades was unleashed with the direct and conscious provocation of Great Britain. The Government of the latter counted on giving support to Russia and France only to such a point as to exhaust Germany also—its mortal enemy—while exhausting them (Russia and France). But the strength of the German military machine was too threatening and required the actual and not an apparent intervention of England in the war. The

rôle of the cynical broker which Great Britain had always assumed by an old tradition, fell to the lot of the United States. The Government of Wilson was able more easily to reconcile itself to the English blockade, which cut off speculation by the American Stock Exchange in European blood, since the countries of the Entente rewarded the American bourgeoisie by generous profits for the violation of "international law."

But the enormous military superiority of Germany impelled even the Government of Washington to depart from its position of fictitious neutrality. The United States assumed with respect to Europe as a whole that very rôle which England had played in past wars, and tried to play in this last war, with respect to the continent—that of weakening one camp with the assistance of the other, and of intervening in military operations only in order to secure for self all the advantages of the situation. Wilson's stake was not large, as is the method of American lotteries, but it was the last stake and thus secured to him the prize.

The contradictions of the capitalist system became clear to mankind in the result of the war, in the form of actual suffering, of hunger, cold, epidemic diseases and moral collapse. Thus the academic discussion within the ranks of socialism on the question of the theory of impoverishment and the gradual passing from capitalism to socialism, is now being finally decided. For decades statisticians and scholars of the theory of the reconciliation of these contradictions have tried to collect from all the corners of the world actual and fictitious facts to prove

the increased well-being of separate groups and categories of the working class. The theory of the impoverishment of the masses was considered to have been buried under the contemptuous voice of the eunuchs of the bourgeois pulpit and the mandarins of the socialistic opportunism. At the present moment this impoverishment, which is now not only social but psychological and biological, lies before our eyes in all its terrible actuality. The catastrophe of the imperialistic war has swept aside completely all the conquests of the trade unions and of parliamentary struggle, while this struggle has outgrown in a similar manner the internal tendencies of capitalism, and at the same time all the economic deals and parliamentary compromises, which have been buried in blood and filth.

Financial capital which threw mankind into the whirlpool of war has itself suffered catastrophic changes during the course of this war. The dependence of money tokens on the material foundations of production has been completely destroyed. More and more losing their significance, the means and regulators of capitalistic exchange of goods, and paper money, have become merely the weapon of requisitions, seizure and, in general, of military-economic oppression. The deterioration of paper now reflects the general mortal crisis of the capitalistic system of exchange of commodities. For free competition as the regulator of production and distribution was pushed to one side in the main fields of industry by the system of trusts and monopolies already during the decades preceding the war, so that by the course of the

war the regulating and directing rôle has been wrested from the hands of economic combinations, and has been turned over directly to the military—state authorities.

The distribution of raw materials, the utilization of petroleum of Baku and Roumanian fields, of the coal of Donetz, of Ukrainian grain, the fate of the German shipping and automobile, the guaranteeing to starving Europe of grain and meat—all these fundamental questions of the economic life of the world are being regulated not by free competition and not by combinations of national and international trusts, but by the direct application of military force in the interest of its further self-preservation.

If the complete subjection of state authority to financial capital brought mankind to the capitalistic shambles, so, thanks to this conflict, financial capital has completely militarized not only the state but also itself, and is now no longer able to fulfill its fundamental economic functions other than by means of iron and blood.

The opportunists who before the war appealed to the workmen to be moderate in the name of a gradual transition to socialism, who during the war demanded class peace in the name of unity for the cause of national defense—are once more demanding of the proletariat self-abnegation, this time in order to overcome the terrible consequences of the war. If this preaching would be accepted by the working masses, then imperialistic development would be reestablished on the bones of several generations, in new and even more terrible forms, with

the new perspective of an inevitable world war. Fortunately for mankind this is impossible.

The absorption by the state of economic life, against which capitalistic liberalism protested with such force, has now become an accomplished fact. There can be no return, either to free competition or to the rule of trusts, syndicates, and other economic monsters. The question now is who will be the mainstay of production that has come under the control of the state: An imperialistic state or a state of the victorious proletariat. In other words, will all toiling mankind become the serfs of a victorious world-clique which under the name of "League of Nations," with the assistance of "international army," "international navy," will suppress some, feed others, and everywhere impose chains on the proletariat, for the sole purpose of maintaining its own rule? Or will the working class of Europe and of the progressive countries of other parts of the world itself take possession of the disrupted and disorganized economic situation, in order to guarantee its rehabilitation on socialist principles.

The epoch of crisis through which the world is passing can be brought to a close only by the measures adopted under the proletarian dictatorship, which does not look back to the past and does not take into account either inherited privileges or rights of property, but does what is required to save the starving masses, mobilizes to this end all means and force, introduces universal labor service, establishes a régime of labor discipline, in order thus, during the course of several years, not only to

heal the gaping wounds inflicted by the war but also to raise mankind to a new height until now unknown.

The national state which gave powerful impulse to imperialistic development became too crowded for the development of the productive forces. The position of the small states became all the more difficult, distributed as they were among the large powers of Europe and all other parts of the world. These small states which came into existence at various times, as fragments of larger states, as small change used to pay for certain services, as strategic buffer states, have their dynasties, their ruling cliques and their imperialistic pretensions. Their illusory dependence until the war was supported by the same thing that supported the equilibrium of Europe: that is the constant antagonism between two imperialistic camps. The war destroyed this equilibrium. The enormous preponderance of Germany had forced the small states to seek safety in the magnanimity of German imperialism. Later when Germany was beaten, the bourgeoisie of the small states, together with the patriotic-socialists, turned to welcome the triumphant victory of the Allies, and in the hypocritical fourteen points of the Wilsonian program began to seek guarantees for their future independent existence. At the same time a number of small states grew out from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and new states were divided up from the Czar's Empire, and these new states scarcely born are already going at each other's throats over state frontiers. The Allied imperialists in the meanwhile suppress combinations of small states, old and new, in order to get

possession of them by taking advantage of their mutual hatred and general helplessness. By suppressing and using violence on small and weak peoples delivering them to famine and demoralization, the Allied imperialists, just as did the imperialists of the Central Empires only a short time ago, constantly speak of the right of the nations to self-determination, though this right has definitely been trampled under foot both in Europe and in other parts of the world.

Small people can be guaranteed the possibility of their existence only by a proletarian revolution, which will liberate the productive forces of all countries from the restrictions of national States, will unite people, will guarantee their economic coöperation on the basis of a common economic plan and will make it possible for the weak and small people to enjoy complete freedom in the administration of the affairs of its own national culture without any detriment to the united and centralized European world economic system.

The late war which was to a considerable extent a war because of colonies was at the same time a war with the aid of the colonies. An unprecedented proportion of the population was drawn into the European war. Why did the Indians, Negroes, and Arabs fight on the battle fields of Europe? For their right to remain slaves of England and France. Never before was the picture of the disgrace of the imperialistic state colonies so clear and never was the problem of colonial slavery raised in such sharp relief. The result has been a series of open uprisings and revolutionary movements in all colonies. In

Europe itself, Ireland, which did not take part in the bloody street battles, still remains an enslaved country. In Madagascar and in other places troops of a bourgeois republic have on several occasions aroused in the course of the war uprisings of colonial slaves. In India the revolutionary movement has not ceased for a single day and recently has led to unprecedented workmen's strikes in Asia, to which the Government of Great Britain has answered with armored motor cars.

Thus the colonial question has risen to its full stature not only on the maps of the diplomatic congress in Paris, but also in the colonies themselves. The program of Wilson has as its aim at the very best a change in the firm-name for colonial slavery. The liberation of the colonies is possible only if it is accompanied by a liberation of the working class of the metropolis. The workmen and peasants not only in Annam, Algeria, and Senegal, but also of Persia and Armenia, will be able to enjoy independent existence only when the workmen of England and France overthrow Lloyd George and Clemenceau and take state authority into their own hands. In the more developed colonies the struggle not only is in progress at the present moment under the flag of liberation, but it is also taking on a more or less clearly expressed social character. If capitalistic Europe forcibly dragged the most retrograde into the whirlpool of capitalist relations, then the Europe of Socialists will come to the assistance of the freed colonies with its technique, its organization, and its cultural influences, in order to

hasten their transition to an orderly organized socialistic economic system.

Colonial slaves of Africa and Asia! The hour of the proletarian dictatorship will strike also for you as the hour of your liberation.

The whole bourgeois world accuses the Communist of destroying liberties and political democracy. This is not true. On coming into power the proletariat simply shows how absolutely impossible it is to apply the methods of bourgeois democracy, and so creates the conditions and forms of a new and superior democracy of the worker. The whole course of capitalistic development, particularly in the last period of imperialism, undermined political democracy, not only by dividing the camp into two irreconcilably hostile classes, but also by condemning the numerically large petty-bourgeois and workmen-proletarian classes to economic benumbing, and also the disinherited lower ranks of the proletariat itself.

The working class of all countries in its historic development has taken advantage of the régime of political democracy in order to organize against capital. The same thing will take place in those countries where the conditions for a working class revolution have not matured. But the broad intermediary masses, not only in the villages but also in the cities, are held back by capitalism, falling behind by whole epochs in respect to historic development. The peasants of Bavaria and Baden are still strongly attached to their village belfry. The small French wine-grower, who has been ruined by the large-scale capitalistic adulterations of wine, the small Amer-

ican farmer who has been robbed and deceived by the banker—all of these people who have been shoved aside by capitalism, have been called into the administration of the state under the régime of political democracy. But in reality in all other questions, that determine the fate of peoples, the financial oligarchy puts through its own decisions behind the wall of parliamentary democracy. This was true particularly in questions of the war, and this is what is taking place now in questions of peace.

To demand of the proletariat that in this last struggle, not for life but to death, with capital, it should loyally observe the demands of political democracy, is the same as to demand of a man who is defending his life and existence from highway robbers that he should observe the scientific and well-guarded rules of the French system of boxing, which rules have been made by his enemy and are not observed by the latter.

When the principles of destruction govern, then the proletariat is obliged to create its own apparatus, which will serve first of all to protect the internal bonds of the working class, guarantee the possibility of its revolutionary intervention in the further development of humanity. The old parties, the old organization of trade unions, have proved, in the persons of their directing leaders, incapable of deciding or even understanding the problems which the new epoch has raised. The proletariat has created a new type of organization which stretches out wide over the whole working mass, independent of trade or of the level of political development attained. It is a flexible apparatus which can be constantly re-

newed, developed, and which can bring within its sphere constantly new forces, and open its doors for the proletariat and for the toiling classes of city and village. This organization is the self-government of the working class and represents the most powerful conquest and weapon of the proletariat in our present epoch.

In all countries where the toiling masses live a conscious life, Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies are being established and will be established. The most important task at the present moment of the conscious and honorable workmen of all countries is to strengthen the Soviets, to increase their authority and to imitate the governmental apparatus of Russia. By means of Soviets the working class is able to save itself from the disintegration which is developing in its midst as the result of the infernal anguish of war, hunger, violence produced by the propertied class and the treason of the high authorities. By means of Soviets the workmen class can more surely and easily come into power in all those countries where Soviets rally around themselves the majority of the toilers. By means of Soviets the working class will direct all branches of the economic and cultural life of the country, just as this is taking place at the present moment in Russia.

The collapse of the imperialistic state, from the Czarist to the most democratic inclusive, goes on simultaneously with the collapse of the imperialistic military system. The armies of many millions mobilized by the imperialists could be kept under only so long as the proletariat submitted to the yoke of the bourgeoisie. The break-

down of national unity means the inevitable disintegration of the army. This took place first in Russia, and then in Germany, and in Austria. The same also is to be expected in other imperialist countries. The uprising of the peasant against the landlord, of the workmen against the capitalist, of both against the monarchic bureaucracy inevitably leads to the uprising of soldiers against officers and in the next step to the sharp division between the proletarian and bourgeois elements within the army. The imperialistic war which pitted one nation against the other has passed, and is passing, into civil war which pits class against class.

The outcry of the bourgeois world against civil war and "Red" terror is the most colossal hypocrisy which the history of political struggle has known. There would not be civil war if cliques of exploiters, who had brought humanity to the edge of ruin, would not oppose every step forward of the toilers, would not organize conspiracies and murders and would not call in armed assistance from outside, in order to maintain or reestablish their predatory privileges. Civil war is forced on the working class by the latter's mortal enemies. The working class must answer blow for blow, unless it renounces itself and its own future. Never artificially provoking civil war, a Communist Party strives to shorten its duration as much as possible, to reduce the number of victims and above all to guarantee victory to the proletariat. This makes necessary the simultaneous disarming of the bourgeoisie, the arming of workmen, and the creation of a Communist army to defend the authority of the proleta-

riat and the inviolability of its socialist structure. Such is the "Red" Army of Soviet Russia, which sprang up and exists as the bulwark of the conquest of the working class against all attacks from within or without. The Soviet authority is inseparable from the Soviet state.

Recognizing the world character of their mission, the enlightened workmen from the very first stages of the socialist movement worked for its international union. The foundation stone for the latter was laid in 1864 in London, in the First International. The Franco-Prussian War, as a result of which sprang up the Germany of the Hohenzollerns, destroyed the First International, though at the same time it gave rise to the development of national workmen's parties. As early as 1889 these parties united at the congress in Paris and created the Second International. However, the center of gravity of the workmen's movement lay then in the field of national parliamentary activity. The decades of organization and reform work created a whole generation of leaders, the majority of whom in words organized the program of social revolution, but in actual practice rejected it and became lost in reformism. The opportunistic character of the leading parties of the Second International was concealed to the very last moment and led to the greatest collapse in the history of the world at a very moment when revolutionary methods of struggle were required of parties of the working class. If the War of 1870 dealt a blow to the First International, by showing that there was no consolidated force of masses behind its social revolutionary programs, in the same

way the war of 1914 killed the Second International when it showed that behind the powerful organization of workmen stood parties who were being converted into submissive organs of the bourgeois state. What is said here refers not only to the Socialists-Patriots who have now clearly and openly gone over to the camp of the bourgeoisie and have become the latter's favorite confidential delegates, mere wooden people and the most reliable executioners of the working class, but also to the hazy irresolute tendency of the Center which tries to reëstablish the Second International, i. e., the narrowest opportunism and revolutionary impotence of its directing leaders. The Independent Party in Germany, the Majority Socialist Party of France, the group of Mensheviks of Russia, the Independent Labor Party of England and other similar groups in actual fact are trying to establish themselves in the place which was occupied before the war by the old official parties of the Second International, coming forward as before only with ideas of compromise and agreement, paralyzing in every way the energy of the proletariat, dragging out the crisis, and increasing the misery of Europe.

Brushing aside the half-heartedness, lies, and corruption of the obsolete official socialist parties we, Communists, uniting in the Third International consider ourselves to be the direct successors of the heroic efforts and martyrdom of a long series of revolutionary generations, from Bebel to Carl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. Just as the First International indicated the road of future development, and as the Second International

gathered together and organized millions of proletarians, so the Third International is the International of open mass action of revolutionary realization. Socialist criticism has sufficiently stigmatized the bourgeois world order. (This last sentence taken from another translation as evidently omitted by printer in text used for this translation.) The aim of the International Communist Party is to overthrow it, and to raise in its place the structure of the socialist order. We call on all workmen and workwomen of all countries to unite under the Communist flag, which is the flag of the first great victories.

Proletarians of all countries, in the struggle against imperialist barbarism, against monarchies, against privileged classes, against the bourgeois state and bourgeois property (text used here has misprint, but elsewhere word is "property"), and against all kinds and form of class or national oppression—unite.

Under the flag of Workmen's Soviets, of the revolutionary struggle for power and of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the flag of the Third International, proletarians of all countries, unite!

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

3

1

Form L-9
290m-12, 390cm(86)

100

100

100

100

100



L 007 612 661 4

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 114 826 9

